



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Monte

1855

633



6000023670

35.

603.





A LETTER

TO THE

REV. JOHN KING, M.A.

INCUMBENT OF CHRIST'S CHURCH, HULL;

OCCASIONED BY

HIS PAMPHLET

ENTITLED,

"MAITLAND NOT AUTHORIZED TO CENSURE MILNER."

BY S. R. MAITLAND.



PRINTED FOR J. G. AND F. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE, FALL MALL,
T. JEW, GLOUCESTER;
STRONG, BRISTOL AND EXETER; AND MILLIKEN, DUBLIN.

1835.

603.

GLoucester.
JEW AND BRYANT, PRINTERS,
2207 CATH STREET.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS; with an enquiry as to the *mode* in which the controversy should be conducted; and the *principles* by which it should be regulated, p. 1.

On my misquotation of Mosheim, p. 8.—Milner's "mistake" in quoting Allix, p. 9.—his "compression" of Reinerius Saccho's testimony, p. 12.

I. PROPOSITION—That while Milner professed to remedy certain defects of preceding historians, by going to "original records," he very seldom went to any such records, p. 17.

Milner's professions, p. 17.—Mr. Scott's voucher, and the Christian Observer's, p. 20.—Dean Milner's testimony, and on the nature and value of his editorial assistance, p. 21.—What are "original sources?" p. 22.—Did Milner read John Brompton's Chronicle? p. 24.—Authorities consulted by Milner for the period A.D. 400—1200. p. 26.

II. PROPOSITION—That compiling from modern writers—generally from such as he disagreed with—without examining their authorities—he was frequently affected by their mistakes or prejudices, and generally confined to their defective statements, p. 27.

Did Milner so compile? p. 27.—List of writers used by him, p. 28.—Miracle in the Vandalic persecution, p. 29.—Character of Fleury and Gibbon, p. 32.—Did Milner try to ruin the credit of those from whom he borrowed? p. 33. Did he examine their authorities? p. 36.—Victor Vitensis and "Ingulph's History," p. 37.—The Paulicians; alterations made by Dean Milner, p. 38.—Meginher, p. 41.—Milner's idea of writers of the twelfth century—Anselm, p. 42. n.—The tenth century, p. 43.—Gislebertus, 45.—Vicelinus, Anscarius, p. 46.—Rembert, p. 47.—Adalbert, p. 48.—Conversion of Denmark, p. 49.

III. PROPOSITION —That he frequently copied incorrectly—garbled,—and intentionally altered, what he professed to quote, p. 50.

John Climachus, p. 50.—Gregory the Great, p. 51.—The Golden Legend, p. 53.—Is Milner's work valued by its admirers for history, or for theology? p. 53.—Patto, p. 56. Tanco, p. 57. Peregrinus, p. 59. Anselm of Havelburg, p. 60. Incorrect references, p. 62. Dean Milner's corrections, p. 63. n. Letter of Hosius, p. 65. Vandalic persecution, p. 65. Vigilius Tapsensis, Pope Gregory III., Grosseteste, p. 67. Intentional alterations, p. 73. Anselm's owl, p. 74.

Milner's work calculated to give an erroneous view of the actual state of the church during a great part of that period of which he undertook to write the history, p. 76. — The same view given by Mr. Raikes and the Christian Observer, p. 80.—In the Christian's Family Library, and by Mr. King himself, p. 81.—Mark the Hermit, and Paulinus of Nola, p. 82. n.—The extent, and the kind of reading necessary for Milner's undertaking, p. 84.

A LETTER, &c.

REVEREND SIR,

After reading your announcement which was published in the British Magazine on the 1st of July, I was naturally curious to see your strictures on my censure of Milner's Church History—strictures by which, as you boasted, "no small part" of that censure was to be made to recoil on myself. I need not tell you that my curiosity was not gratified for nearly a month; but I must say that, when I did see your pamphlet, I was greatly surprised to find that it contained not a word respecting my second letter to Mr. Rose—not even an acknowledgment that any such letter existed. That letter was published early in February; and your pamphlet did not reach me until the 25th of July; and, according to the best information which I can obtain, it was then only just published, notwithstanding the date of the dedication is as far back as May. Had it however been then published, sufficient time would have been allowed to render it most improbable that you had not seen my second letter—but without arguing on probabilities, you must allow me to assume as a fact, that you did know of that second letter; and purposely avoided all mention of it.

But will your readers believe this? You talk of repelling "certain charges recently brought against Milner's Church History;" and in describing them you say that "many" appear to be unfounded and exaggerated, and "ALL tinged with undue severity." You speak throughout in terms which would lead your readers to take it for granted, that you had in view *all* that I had published on the subject. In fact, after taunting

me at p. 48. with the "*great paucity* of materials for censure," you boldly ask, at the close of your pamphlet, "Has he not failed in ALL his most serious allegations?" p. 82. I have put the plain question to you privately, and you have refused to answer it—I now ask you publicly, did you not know of my second letter to Mr. Rose when you published your pamphlet?

In the mean time, you must allow me to assume that you had seen it; and that, having done so, you have thought fit to say nothing about it, and as little as possible about what you could not pretend not to have seen, and to try if you could not in some way or other run me down, and persuade people (by getting them on a subject which they do not generally understand, and with respect to which few have the means of reference) that I am such a person, that whatever I may write deserves no attention. Abandoning—indeed, never actually entering on—the defence of Milner, you seem only anxious to be revenged on me for saying things of his history which you cannot disprove. Suppressing the fact that the pamphlet of mine to which you refer does not contain one half of my censures on Milner's History, you set to work to persuade your readers that I have no right to censure it at all. And why? Is it because it does not deserve censure? No—this question you slur over, as much as the nature of your design will allow. As to most of the charges (as you call them, and I will for brevity's sake, adopt the term in as inoffensive a sense as it will bear) you say *nothing whatever*; and seem, therefore, to admit that if they had been made by a respectable person, you would have had nothing to say; but, as it is, *I* am not authorised to make these charges, because, as you think, I do myself deserve censure for other things which I have written. Your argument seems to be, that in certain statements respecting the Albigenes and Waldenses, I have made mistakes; and that, therefore (whatever privilege infallible persons may enjoy) I have no right to say that anybody else has made mistakes, or to point out errors in the work of any other man. It seems to me strange reasoning—is it with such feelings that you have taken upon you the office

of a preacher to your fellow sinners? You will understand that in writing thus I do not acknowledge that you have pointed out any mistake, except one of which I will speak presently; but I ask—supposing that, for the sake of argument, I should grant that my book about the Albigenses is full of mistakes, and shews that I can write nothing better than very bad books myself, does that prove that I cannot see the mistakes of others? May I not think, and have I not a right if I do think so to say, that the table at which I write is rickety and badly made, though I am conscious that I could not make even so good a table myself? But, beside this, you will remember (and so will your readers) that I did not call upon you to believe that Milner had made mistakes, on my *authority*—I did not ask people to believe me, but to look for themselves—I furnished you with *specific facts and references*; of by far the greater part of which you take *no notice* whatever. You have not answered them—and as to the greater part, even if it should appear that I have made mistakes in some cases, of which I am not aware, I venture to say, you cannot answer them—and nothing, I think, but the consciousness of this can account for the line of defence which you have adopted. Can you thus satisfy yourself—or do you expect to satisfy your less competent brethren, who think with you, as to the merits of Milner's History, though, as you seem to insinuate, they do not very well know why, and cannot themselves defend what they admire? Some of them, at least, who are not privy to your design, and who would not have dreamed of anticipating your line of argument, are looking to you as the champion of Milner's History. They care not whether I am right or wrong about the Albigenses, or anything else, except those very charges which you affect not to hear. Can you, I must repeat, think to satisfy them by saying, “Do not listen to him—he is not authorized—he is a very stupid dishonest person who has made as great mistakes himself as those which he charges on Milner.” There may perhaps be some, though I should hope but very few, who taking your own word for your correctness, would enjoy a mere act of revenge; but I think there are others who are inte-

rested in the controversy who would reply, "Well, but who cares about *his* mistakes, unless they are mistakes in these charges against Milner's history—what have you to say to *them*? are *they* mistakes? You may speak of "great paucity," but to us it seems that there are a good many, and we shall be glad to find that they are erroneous. Suppose it to be, as you say, that Milner is right, and Maitland is wrong, about that one point of the Albigenses, yet that is but *one* point; and *even there* you do not venture to deny that if Milner was right, it was by following the stream of popular writers, without *once* referring to any *original authority*. We hoped you had been going to defend Milner."

Some I think will feel in this way. The censures are in the hands of many persons who know and care nothing about you and me; who would not believe or disbelieve much on the bare *authority* of either of us; and who have, by this time, turned out some of my references in their own copies of Milner. They know, though they have not to thank you for the information, that there is in existence a second letter to Mr. Rose, in which I anticipated just the sort of evasion which you are attempting to practice. Some of them will even believe that you had read these words in it;—"As it occurred to me that Milner's admirers "might suggest that the chief part of the objections which I had "previously raised related to a matter of fact on which I differed from him, and on which I might naturally wish to diminish his authority, I thought it would be best to begin the "second volume, and keep quite clear of the Waldenses. I "entered therefore on an examination of the *Fourth Century*" &c. You will find it quite impossible, Sir, so to throw dust in people's eyes as to make them believe that this is a controversy whether Milner's account of the Waldenses is right or wrong. They know that though made in a work the subject of which gives colour to your evasion, these strictures did not assert that he was peculiarly or particularly wrong in his mode of getting up that part of his history which relates to the Albigenses and Waldenses, though I there differed from him as to facts. They

know, too, that in those first strictures (and you do not pretend not to have seen them) my "specific" charge related to the *tenth* century, of which, I do not perceive that you say *one word*.

I repeat my regret that you should so run away from the real question, to raise one that is merely personal; but that seems to have been your object, not only in your pamphlet, but in your announcement of it in the *British Magazine*. If you chose to quarrel with the Editor of that publication for anything which he had written, it is no business of mine, and he is quite able to defend himself; but what right had you to drag me into the business? What right had you to sneer at me as an ardent spirit, a merciless antagonist, whose noble ambition could not be satisfied without mowing down a mass of coward troops with a sabre? What had I done to elicit this high-flown matter? How was I responsible for what I never saw until I saw it in the magazine? Whatever might be the taste, or the wisdom, or the justice, of your reply to the Editor, it was as it regards myself, mere unprovoked aggression. Nobody, I think, can wonder that the Editor should write as he did; and if I too had complained that when "a distinct and specific charge supported by "particular instances," * so scornfully called for, had been made, it had been (as far as I know, with the exception of some notice of the first pamphlet in one of the minor periodicals) received by the eulogists of Milner in perfect silence. I might perhaps have lawfully complained, and I should probably have done so if an opportunity had offered, and I had thought it would do any good; but I know too well how common it is with people to throw stones and run away, and how very hard of hearing they are when they are called back. Men too often come out with big words and broad assertions, and when these are shewn to be false they affect not to hear as long as they can, and then pretend that they are very ill-used persons because they are called upon for the sake of religion, for the sake of truth and

* Scott's Vindication, p. 47.

common honesty, even for the sake of their own characters, either to maintain or retract their statements. I might have said this, and a good deal more, which has been forced on my mind by some years' experience in controversy ; but, in point of fact, I had said nothing at all—and even if I had complained, and had said all the uncivil things in the world, why should it have offended you ? I do not even now know that you had ever committed yourself as an eulogist of Milner ; and, until you wrote to announce your pamphlet in the British Magazine, I did not know of your existence. If I had spoken of the matter, I should have referred to Mr. Raikes, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Bickersteth—men whose character gives a weight to their assertions which makes it very important that those assertions should be correct—and, most particularly, to the Christian Observer ; which contains the most fulsome and false panegyric on Milner's History which I have seen. I should have supposed that some of these gentlemen would have felt called upon to maintain or retract their statements, and I cannot agree with you in thinking that they have been kept silent by mere incompetence. You tell us that when Milner's History was censured, “ Mr. Scott alone appeared competent to execute ” the task of defending it. You present to us a sad, and I hope not quite a true, picture of the blind following their leader. Mr. Scott affirmed that Milner's History was as much *venerated* by a *large proportion* of the members of our establishment as any work of modern times—and you tell us that he alone appeared competent to reply to charges very plainly made of its incorrectness. I should be sorry to believe, and in fact I do not believe, all this. I am convinced that whatever it may be it is not a want of competency to judge in so plain a matter, which keeps these gentlemen silent ; and, if I invite them to discuss the question, I am sure it is not with any view, or any wish, to mow them down with a sabre ; but for the open establishment of truth, and for the increase of such knowledge as is very necessary, though very much neglected, in these times. I certainly do wish that any, or all, of them would fully meet the question ; but whether they

see fit to do this or not, I will take leave to ask them publicly whether they accept you for their champion, and are satisfied that the controversy should be carried on in the manner which you have adopted—that is by making it quite a personal question—and whether they, as the friends of Milner, will agree that I have fully and fairly answered you, and completely vindicated my censures of Milner, if I can point out in your pamphlet some mistakes as gross as any for which I have censured Milner, or you have censured me—whether in short they are prepared to admit that Milner's cause admits of no other *mode* of defence than that which you have adopted, or that under all circumstances they consider it the best.

In the mean time, as I am sincerely glad to find any body taking up the subject in any way, I proceed to notice what you have said respecting Milner. As to the question of the Albigenes, having hitherto desired and endeavoured to keep it, as much as possible, distinct, I shall continue to do so; but I beg you to understand that, in thus postponing the consideration of that question, I concede nothing whatever; and, though I by no means dispute your right to find fault with anything which I have written, or may write (whatever blunders you may make yourself) yet I think even from a cursory glance at the Albigenian part of your pamphlet, that it will not be difficult to shew, not only that I do not deserve your censures, but that, on *your* principles, *you* have no right to censure me at all.

I will, however, in this letter confine myself as much as possible to the question respecting Milner, as soon as I have noticed one charge which you bring against me, not immediately connected with either Milner or the Albigenes. I make this exception for two reasons—First, because it is so serious a charge of fraud that I cannot consent to pass by the earliest opportunity of replying to it. Charges of ignorance, impudence, stupidity, and the like, are of less consequence and may wait; but to have done that with which you charge me should not only destroy all confidence in my written statements, but exclude me from all such society as I would desire to enter. Secondly, because,

having asked respecting the *mode* in which the friends of Milner desire to see this controversy conducted, I am equally anxious to know their opinion as to the *principles* by which it should be regulated; and this charge, which you bring against me, is so stated as to offer an opportunity of explaining what I mean by the question. You say, at p. 25;—

“In order to show how unsafe it is to quote the English translation of Mosheim (which, I agree with him, is culpably paraphrastic, and often unfaithful), he charges Maclaine with giving a sense to Mosheim’s words the *very reverse* of what he really has given, and then gravely blames the translator of Mosheim for the blunder which he himself has committed! I subjoin in parallel columns the censured passage from Maclaine’s translation, and Mr. Maitland’s version of it, that the reader may without difficulty compare them both.

MACLAINE’S TRANSLATION.

“‘It appears most probable that the Paulicians were a branch of some of the ancient Gnostic sects, which were extremely numerous and diversified.

MAITLAND’S VERSION.

It appears most probable that, the Paulicians were extremely numerous and diversified.’

“Mr. Maitland, having left out a clause which entirely alters the sense of the whole passage, proceeds with this reproof: “The translator has taken the liberty to put in and *put out* important matter. Mosheim does not say, that the Paulicians ‘were extremely numerous,’ or at all ‘diversified.’”

“Neither does Maclaine represent him as saying so, anywhere but in the pages of Mr. Maitland. The omission of a whole line gives a new meaning to the mutilated sentence, and makes the writer say that of the Paulicians, which he really says of Gnostic sects. On a mistake of Milner’s which would not weigh a feather in the scale with this, our author makes the following caustic remark: ‘The mere discovery that any writer had done such a thing, would so destroy my confidence in him, that I should consider his work, not merely of no value, but as a mischievous and injurious thing WHICH OUGHT TO BE EXPOSED!’

“Mutato nomine, de te
Fabula narratur.---НОВ.”

Yes, Sir; and, notwithstanding your classical application, I feel bound to repeat my remark; for, though it may be a fable when told of me, yet it is not so with respect to the case which led to my making it. I *put out* nothing; and as to Maclaine’s not representing Mosheim as saying what I stated, “anywhere but in Mr. Maitland’s pages” I must beg leave to state that,

though strictly speaking, Maclaine himself cannot be said to have so represented Mosheim, either in my pages or anywhere else, yet Mosheim is in fact so represented in the only edition of Maclaine's translation which I possess, and which I have habitually used for many years. I do not dispute that it is wrong; but the passage does, in fact, stand precisely as I have given it, in the edition printed for Baynes, in six vols. 8vo. London, 1819; nor had I, until I saw your statement, the least idea that it stood otherwise anywhere else. Had there been anything to excite suspicion, I hope I should have collated my copy with one of some other edition; a piece of justice which I have before now taken the trouble to render to Maclaine; but it was so usual with him to put in and put out as he pleased, that I should never have thought of suspecting the printer in such a case. I know not what else to say of this mistake, but that I am very sorry for it; and that on your authority I have inserted the omitted words in the text, and erased the note in my own copy; and I hope that all other persons who may possess the book, or the pamphlet, will do the same.

But now let me say a few words on the "mistake" of Milner, which led to my making what you call a "caustic" remark—a "mistake" which you represent as weighing less than a feather when set against my iniquity. What can you mean by calling it a "mistake"? I wish you had referred to the place where I made the remark, instead of giving your readers no choice but either to take the matter on your mere assertion, or else to hunt through all that I have written, for the words which you quote, and the occasion on which I used them. I am persuaded that some of them will form a very different judgment from yours; and that some at least—and those among the warmest friends of Milner—will be both surprised and grieved to find you talking about a "mistake." You will, I believe, admit, that the following are the facts of the case;—Milner tells us of a letter written by Evervinus, and of which a part was published in English by Allix; and having referred his readers to "Allix Churches of Piedmont, p. 140," he gives a long extract from that letter

between inverted commas, and without any hint whatever of alteration. Yet we find that the passages stand thus in the works of Allix and Milner respectively; the words which I now distinguish by *italics* in the latter of the following extracts, being substituted for those which I so mark in the former. In Allix, we read

"There have been lately some heretics discovered amongst us, near Cologne, *whereof some* with satisfaction returned again to the Church: *two of these, viz. one that was a Bishop amongst them*, and his companions, openly opposed us in the assembly of the clergy and laity, *the Lord Archbishop himself being present, with many of the nobility, maintaining their heresy from the words of Christ and the Apostles. But when they saw they could go no further,* they desired that a day might be appointed for them, *upon which they might bring along with them men skilful in their belief,* promising to return to the church, provided they *should find their masters defective in answering what was opposed to them;* but that otherwise they would rather die than depart from their judgment. Upon this *their declaration, after that for three days together they had been admonished, and found unwilling to repent,* they were seized by the people, *being incited by overmuch zeal,* and put into the fire and burnt."

Milner gives the passage thus;—

"There have been lately some heretics discovered among us near Cologne, *though several of them have,* with satisfaction, returned again to the Church. *One of their Bishops* and his companions openly opposed us in the assembly of the clergy and laity, *in the presence of the Archbishop of Cologne, and of many of the nobility, defending their heresies by the words of Christ and the Apostles. Finding that they made no impression,* they desired that a day be appointed for them, *on which they might bring their teachers to a conference,* promising to return to the Church, provided they *found their masters unable to answer the arguments of their opponents,* but that otherwise they would rather die than depart from their judgment. Upon *this declaration, having been admonished, to repent for three days,* they were seized by the people *in the excess of zeal, and burnt to death.*"

Now, waiving for the present the question which originally led me to notice this passage, and saying nothing about the fidelity of either extract as a translation, let me ask how this can be called a "mistake?" How can you in common honesty give it such a name? Can you possibly mean that Milner's deviations from Allix were accidental and unintentional? But,

awaiting your answer, let me ask another question, not so much of yourself (for you appear to have expressed your opinion very clearly) but of the friends of Milner's History, and especially of those gentlemen whom I have named;—Is it lawful for one writer thus to alter the words of another writer whom he professes to quote? I will suppose (though it is not so in this very case) that he does not alter the sense, yet, has he a right to alter the words? I ask the question because a difference of opinion on this point must necessarily lead to a different estimate of Milner's work; as it was his practice to alter what he professed to quote, without giving his readers any notice of what he was doing. Such a course seems to me to make a book useless, or even worse than useless; and I must repeat my remark, which you call "caustic;" and which may be so, perhaps, for I believe there is nothing more caustic than pure and simple truth when it comes in contact with any of those substances which it is of its nature to consume;—"It seems to me that "under these circumstances he was not at liberty to make *any* "alteration whatever; and I must add that, the mere discovery "that any writer had done such a thing, would so destroy my "confidence in him, as that I should consider his work, not "merely of no value, but, as a mischievous and injurious thing, "which ought to be exposed. Let him, if he will, quote laxly "from memory, and tell us so—let him *mistake*, and blunder as "much as he pleases—but *deliberately to alter* the language of "a writer, whose words one professes to quote, (supposing one "could be sure of always exactly preserving the idea) is some- "thing which I cannot reconcile with the fidelity which appears "to me to be the most important qualification for a writer of "history." *

If I seem to dwell on this point, it is because it is one which appears to me to be very important; and one on which we are directly at issue. In the case just noticed, indeed, you call it a "mistake;" which, as I have already said, I do not understand,

* First Letter to Mr. Rose, p. 35.

and I trust you will explain it ; but on another occasion, and one much more important, you defend an intentional and tacit omission, on grounds which do not appear to me to be very clearly defined, but which, so far as I can judge, are to be resolved into some shape of expediency. You say " In the passage of Reinerius, quoted by Allix, it is mentioned as one feature of the Waldensian character, that they pray but little—" *"parum orant."* Milner omits this clause, and is accused of " unfairness in making the omission. But it is to be observed, " that Milner is obviously * abridging the whole passage ; for " he compresses about fifty of the words of Allix into ten ; he " omits clauses favourable to the Waldenses as well as this ; he " had just before produced a witness, who declared that they " prayed much every day ' with great reverence ; ' and if he had " inserted the litigated † words he would have found it necessary " to give some lengthened explanation of their probable meaning." You are right, Sir, it would have required a good deal of explanation, to get a *probable* meaning that would suit—the *real* meaning is so plain, and inevitable. Gretser, and all his society, versed as they were in probabilities, would not have attempted it, and would probably have deemed it expedient to omit the " litigated words." But you go on to say " Certainly he did " not withhold them, because he thought that, though discredited, yet they were true ; or because he feared that he should " not be able to disprove them ; but most probably because he " thought they did not deserve the discussion which, if inserted, " they would require." p. 75.

I really think that as far as Milner's character is concerned, it would have been better to let the matter stand with the excuse

* What can you mean? *How* is it obvious? Do you mean to say that any reader of Milner would suspect that he was abridging, or compressing, or altering? If you do, it will be much for your cause to point out the intimations which should raise that suspicion. If you do not, what can you mean by saying that it is "obvious"? Do you mean that it became obvious when I printed the two passages in parallel columns? I am not aware that anybody had suspected it before.

† How had they been *litigated* when Milner wrote?

which I suggested ; * but the point for our immediate consideration is, that you acknowledge the omission to have been made tacitly and intentionally ; and you defend it. You maintain that if a man cites two witnesses to prove the same point, and it turns out that they give conflicting evidence, he is at liberty to weed, from the testimony of one, an obnoxious statement which contradicts the other, without saying a word about it—that is to “compress,” as you pleasantly term it, the testimony which he professes to give. Here, I repeat, we differ entirely, and I must add that to talk of “compression” where ideas, and very important ones, are quite squeezed out, seems to me to be a very questionable mode of excusing a very improper practice. But you tell us that Milner, if he had not done this, would have had to “give some lengthened explanation.” Why, Sir, you proceed immediately to give us the explanation ; and, so far from its being of terrific length, it is really comprised in two sentences, and less than a dozen lines. After what I have just quoted, you go on to say, “Mr. Maitland produces a similar “allegation, but more fully detailed, from the same writer, “respecting the Cathari. He declares that ‘for seventeen years “‘he never saw any one of them engaged in private prayer.’ “Both assertions appear to me to admit of the same reply ;” and then you come to the lengthened explanation. “The parties censured were mindful of the Saviour’s injunction : ‘But “‘thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when “‘thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in “‘secret ;’ and THIS WAS THE REASON why they seemed to Reine-
“rius to be living without prayer. They did not, like the

* “I shall not, however, shrink from saying what I think of the matter, which is simply this—that Milner did see it—that he knew very little about the heretics, or the inquisitors, of the thirteenth century ; but had a general, and though rather a vague, yet a very strong, idea that the one was a very good and the other a very bad set of people—that this charge was a bit of prejudice, or malice, or mistake on the part of the Inquisitor which he not only might quietly omit, but which it was on the whole best and most expedient to say nothing about.”—First Letter to Mr. Rose, p. 48.

“Romanists, pause in the midst of their employments, or their diversions to count their beads, or mutter forth the unfelt language of devotion ; and consequently were regarded by their enemies as despising and neglecting prayer.”

Indeed—“*this was the reason*”—and these two sentences contain the “lengthened explanation.” But, in the exercise of that liberty which you defend, you have “compressed” the testimony of Reinerius a little, or you would have been obliged to explain your explanation. You put the allegation of Reinerius, which you say that I produce, between marks of quotation ; but I do not know where you found it in that form, if indeed you did find it anywhere in my book. I may however have, somewhere, used the words which you profess to quote in speaking of a writer so often referred to, though I do not remember to have done it ; but you must be aware that in the place where I “produce” this allegation, as the testimony of Reinerius Saccho, it stands thus, “moreover I say that in the seventeen years *during which, alas ! I was in their society*, I never saw any one of them engaged in private prayer apart from others, or manifest sorrow for his sins,” &c. If you had not omitted the words, which I here mark with *italics*, you would have felt that, without some further explanation, your readers would laugh in your face. You may tell them, with some chance of belief, that a popish Inquisitor passed seventeen years without seeing a Catharist at his prayers ; but you must not let them into the secret that *this* Inquisitor had been a leader of the sect, and is speaking of that seventeen years during which he was one of its members—you would have had to explain how a man could be a member of an eminently religious sect for so long a time, and yet remain so ignorant of such a peculiarity in the devotions of that sect, as that during all that period and afterwards, he always imagined that his brethren never prayed at all in private, and very little anywhere else.

This, and some other things, lead me to make a very earnest appeal to the friends of Milner, and particularly to those gentlemen who stand pledged to the public as the eulogists of his

work—to ask them whether they have the same notions respecting “mistakes,” and “explanations,” and “compressions,” and, in short, the same views respecting truth, as those which you appear to hold and to act upon. You seem to me to have no idea of a man’s writing on any controverted subject, except for victory, or for some purpose beside, or beyond, the establishment of truth. You break out into what is I dare say unfeigned astonishment at the idea of a man’s offering conjectures which have a tendency to lessen the weight of a testimony in favour of his own argument, merely for the sake of putting historical facts in a right light. The thing appears to you quite ridiculous, and furnishes matter for sneer and derision. But, however foolish you may think a man who does not suppress what may weaken his argument, did you not know that you were writing mere falsehood—and as far as concerned the argument, or anything else but your own taste for personalities, perfectly gratuitous falsehood—when you represented me, or tried to make your readers believe that I represented myself, as doing it for the “purpose” * of weakening my own evidence? I am indeed deeply and deplorably mistaken if there are not among the admirers of Milner, men whose principles and feelings will make them shrink with disgust from such advocacy.

To come however to the question respecting Milner—only repeating that I hope to meet you fully on the subject of the Albigenses, and that by postponing I do not concede anything—you say “I cannot but think that Mr. Maitland never fully “understood what Milner’s ‘undertaking’ really was, and that “therefore he is unable to judge what kind or extent of reading “the accomplishment of it required. The defects which the “Church Historian sought to supply were not such as referred “to *disputed historical facts*, or to *minute ecclesiastical questions*, which after volumes of controversy might be left still in “uncertainty;”† and on the next page you say “he naturally “passed lightly over the ground on which Mr. Maitland *would “have wished him to dwell with minute attention.*”

* Page 14.

† Page 78.

Now, Sir, is it possible that you could expect to persuade your readers that the faults which I charge on Milner's History are of such a nature as you here insinuate? It would be charging you with gross want of understanding, to suppose that, with my pamphlets in your hands, you could yourself really believe any such thing; and while those pamphlets exist, it is quite unnecessary to do anything but to refer to them for full satisfaction on this point. I will therefore, instead of wasting time in exposing what is so obviously absurd, take your account of the matter as if it was something quite new, and altogether unlike anything which I had ever heard, or read, or said myself. In a passage which occurs between the two which I have just quoted, you say;—"He believed that the spirit of piety breathed "in the most lifeless period, and that the light of grace shone "over the darkest region of the church; and he wished to place "within the reach of the unlearned reader, those pious deeds "and sentiments which had generally received no attention from "the writers of ecclesiastical history." With very little alteration, and such only as I think you will not object to, I entirely subscribe to this. Instead of "no" attention, I should say "too little;" and instead of saying in general terms "the writers of ecclesiastical history," I should say "those writers of ecclesiastical history who are generally known to English readers"—without some such qualification, it would be difficult to say whence Milner was to get his supplementary information, and quite absurd to pretend that he had got any at all. With this alteration, to which I think you will not object, I willingly accept your account of Milner's undertaking; for I desire nothing in the whole matter more earnestly than to come to the real merits of the case, and to agree with the friends of Milner wherever I can.

Such then, I quite agree with you was Milner's undertaking—I have never censured it; and the worst that I have said of it was, that the design was as noble as its execution was feeble and defective; and as from the way in which the controversy arose, and has been carried on, my censures of the work have

been delivered piecemeal, and not in that order and method in which they might have been arranged, if I had originally undertaken to review the whole work, I will here state in distinct propositions those matters which I consider as detracting from, or destroying, the value of Milner's History; annexing some proofs and illustrations, or referring to such as I have already given. This seems to be highly necessary if you, who may be supposed to have given more time to the examination of my censures than most readers, can have so entirely misunderstood—or even can attempt so to misrepresent—the very nature and design of my strictures and notes.

The circumstances, then, which appear to me, and which I have represented as diminishing if not entirely destroying, the value of Milner's History may be, perhaps, stated thus :

I.—*That while he professed to remedy certain defects of preceding ecclesiastical historians (whatever those defects might be) by going to ORIGINAL RECORDS, he very seldom went to any such records.*

On this point Milner made strong and repeated professions; some of which it seems quite necessary to extract.

"I have *all along*, however, to the best of my ability and opportunity, consulted *original records*, and have *never* contented myself with copying the sentiments of modern Historians." I. *pref.* vi.

"So unreasonably has our author been censured for heat and temerity, by writers who seem not to have been much acquainted with his works."*

[On which there is the following note]:—

"How delusive, and yet how common a thing is it, to form our idea of characters from the report of others, rather than from our own knowledge and careful investigation!" II. 446.

"I have done on this occasion, what *I profess to do generally*, to the best of my ability, namely, formed my judgment on *original evidences*, and not on the opinions and reasonings of *any modern* WHATEVER. Laborious task! compared with the ease of copying other historians: invidious also because it often obliges one to oppose modern representations! But it is the task of a *real* historian." II. 430.

"As I write not the history of superstition, but of christian religion, I think not myself obliged to copy *all the accounts I meet with in ancient records* which relate to the former." III. 74.

"As the ground I am now upon has been disputed, I am willing to lay open all the information which *antiquity* can give us." III. 83.

Such statements would surely lead one to suppose that Milner habitually went to original sources; and the same thing is implied when he says;—

"Cyprian was chosen bishop of Carthage—A Star of the first magnitude—when we consider the times in which he lived. Let us recreate ourselves with the contemplation of it: We are fatigued with hunting for christian goodness; and we have discovered but little: and that *with much difficulty*." I. 323.

"I scarcely need say to those, who have read the former volume even with superficial attention, that *my plan* often requires me to be brief, where other historians are immoderately tedious; and to be circumstantial, where they say little, or are silent altogether." Vol. II. *pref.* p. iv.

"To search out the real church from age to age is indeed a work of *much labour and difficulty*; far more so, I apprehend, than can even be conceived by those, whose studies have never been directed to this object. The ore is precious, but it must be extracted from *incredible heaps* of heterogeneous matter." Vol. II. *pr.* p. v.

Some other statements too, of which the following are a specimen, would lead those readers who formed their judgment entirely from Milner's own statements to suppose that he was taking a pretty wide range.

"It is my duty, however, to look for the spouse of Christ, *wherever I can find her*, although she may be disguised in an unsuitable and foreign garb." II. 266.

"I advert, particularly to Bower's Lives of the Popes, and to Warner's Ecclesiastical History of our own country. Their laborious collection of facts deserves commendation. *I avail myself of all the helps which offer, for the supply of materials*. But, I mean to extol the Church of Christ, *wherever I can find her*: nor should a Roman dress, when she appears in it, convey any prejudice to my mind." III. 97.

"In this chapter I shall collect the information upon this subject, which may be extracted from an *enormous* mass of ecclesiastical rubbish." III. 226.

Other expressions would seem to imply that he had investigated all the sources of information which were extant on various subjects; and could only get the brief account which he gives; at least, such perpetual complaints of scanty materials can only be properly made by one who knows what materials exist, and has availed himself of them;—

"If the evangelical reader has not gained much information concerning the spirit of true religion during this violent contest, [the Arian] the times and *the materials* must bear the blame." II. 95.

"I have here to regret, as in the former instance, the *want of materials* for estimating the character of the man, whom Mosheim scruples not to call the good Vigilantius. He quotes indeed Bayle's Dictionary; whence I gather, that the presbyter before us was agreeable to that self-conceited sceptic; but the ambiguity remains unremoved."* II. 479.

"Salvian, Priest of Marseilles, was an eloquent, neat and beautiful writer. His manner is very serious. But of his acquaintance with real Christianity, from the *scanty materials*, which I have seen of him, I find no evidence." II. 547.

"I feel almost ashamed to have written so barren a life of a man undoubtedly excellent in godliness. But the reader, as well as myself, must be content with the *poverty of materials*." III. 4.

"*My records* say no more; and this is one of the *thousand cases* in which I have occasion to regret, how *little of real church history* has been written, how much of ecclesiastical perversions and abuses. III. 20.

Adalbert—"So small is the account transmitted to us of one of the wisest and best of men, &c." III. 254.

"For *want of materials* I cannot dwell on the particulars of the conversion of this people." III. 297.

I think I do not speak unfairly if I say that a work containing such passages as I have quoted is one of considerable pretension. Indeed some expressions would lead those who have read no other history to suppose that Milner was the first person who had done tardy justice to some of the saints of God;

"The efforts of the tenth and three preceding centuries, to extend Christianity, had their blemishes, which have been malignantly insisted on, and even exaggerated by modern writers. Defective, however, as these efforts were, they form the principal glory of those times. If, however, the labours of an obscure individual may attract the attention of the public, the names of Boniface, Anscarius, Adalbert, Unni, and others of the same class, shall be honoured among men." III. 264.

* That is to say, together with Barbeyrac, G. J. Vossius, and the Hist. Lit. de la France, (references which were just useless to Milner) Mosheim refers to Bayle's Dictionary. Can anything be more characteristic or illustrative than the remark? Is it not the genuine language of unconscious ignorance? Is it not enough to make one laugh and cry to see "Mosheim censured" at this rate? Are there not articles in Bayle's Dictionary on Abraham and Mahomet, on Jupiter and Juno, nay on Calvin and Augustine?

"Let it however [the conduct of Alphage] receive the justice which is due to it from these memoirs." III. 300.

All this talk about "original records," and authorities, has led some of the admirers of Milner's History really to suppose that he habitually referred to them; and they have repeatedly vouched for the fact in the most unqualified terms. Mr. Scott declared—

"Mr. M., it is true, frequently gives representations of characters and events differing considerably from those which had been given by preceding historians: but, BE IT REMEMBERED, *he constantly had recourse to the ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS; formed his own judgment from them; and reported accordingly: and his representations are not therefore to be judged incorrect, simply because they are new; they can only be pronounced upon, after as careful an attention as he himself had given to original authorities.*" P. 47.

In the Review, also, which Mr. Scott quotes from the Christian Observer, as containing a "just estimate," and a "real" estimate of the work, we are told;—

"In forming an estimate of Mr. Milner's labours, it must be kept in mind, that the design of his history was entirely new; and that he had therefore to contend with the various difficulties which must be encountered by those who pursue a path hitherto unattempted. It was *necessary* that he should be *thoroughly* acquainted with *all* those materials which had occupied the attention of former writers of church history, with a view to ascertain their bearing upon the particular objects of his research. But it was also *necessary*, that, taking a wider range, he should *penetrate recesses of private history unexplored by his predecessors*; and that, in order to form a true judgment concerning the sentiments and character of individuals, he should *peruse with attention original writings* which before had been almost consigned to oblivion; a task far more laborious and less amusing than commonly falls to the lot of authors." *Scott. Vind.* p. 50.

The Reviewer in addition tells us that "in the work before us, 'names unknown to song,' but inscribed in the book of life, are drawn from their obscurity;" and talks of Milner's "unwearied research." Indeed the voucher given by Dean Milner, and copied by Mr. Scott, coming as it did from one who was* sup-

* I say *was* because it is very curious to observe the different lights in which Dean Milner is placed by Mr. Scott and yourself. In the Vindication, the "vigorous and powerful-minded brother" seemed to be quite the massy buttress of Joseph Milner's reputation; in your

posed to be so well acquainted with the work, and so capable of judging of its execution, would be quite sufficient to lead people in general to talk broadly about Milner's research among original authorities, without their thinking it necessary to examine for themselves. The Dean says ;—

“ His labours abound with luminous details and expositions from *original documents*. The historian has generally an opinion of his own, and a pretty strong one too, nor is he backward in discovering it ; but he is ever anxious to put his reader in possession of the evidence on which it is founded ; to lay before him all, which, he thinks, is authentic, and connected with the subject ;—and so to give him a fair opportunity of judging for himself.” *Scott's Vind.* p. 33.

pamphlet, he appears as the officious and blundering meddler, and the convenient person on whom to throw such mistakes as you chuse to notice. The boasting is changed into querulous lamentation that Joseph Milner should be “condemned for faults *he* never committed, and for prejudices *he* never entertained ;”—but your manner of doing this requires some notice. I had said “The pompous marginal announcement ‘Mosheim censured’ is very ridiculous, and only exposes the prejudice of the writer.” You say “not so ridiculous as is Maitland's attempt to convert it into a fault ; for the marginal reference [it is not a reference of any kind—but an announcement in the margin that Mosheim is censured in the text] “was never known or thought “of, by the writer himself, having no place in the only edition he lived “to publish. But Milner must be condemned for faults he never committed, and for prejudices he never entertained.” p. 47. Now, Sir, is this anything but mere trifling, and is your attempt to distinguish between what Joseph, and Isaac, Milner wrote, anything but a quibble ? I am obliged to you for pointing out to me the variations between the original, and subsequent editions ; but can you pretend that when Mr. Rose lectured the students of Durham, he meant, or they understood him to mean, the original work as it came from the hands of Joseph Milner, and before his brother meddled with it ? Did Mr. Scott, or the Christian Observer, or anybody, understand this ? Suppose I had used the first edition in my notes, would it not have been said that I did injustice to Joseph Milner, who wrote hastily, and perhaps with some want of care ; and that nothing but malice could have made me go to that almost obsolete edition, which perhaps no student of Durham had ever seen, or would ever be likely to see, when there was in every body's hands an edition “with additions and *corrections* by the Rev. Isaac Milner, D.D.F.R.S.” &c. Should I not have been asked, what could induce me to go to the first edition, when the work had been corrected and reprinted by such a man—“the ampli-

I should have supposed that I had said quite enough, in my second letter to Mr. Rose, to shew, that these vouchers for Milner contain statements which are most untrue; but, as you seem disposed to evade the truth, by a species of quibble on the word *original*, and yet, (as if you knew perfectly well what it meant) to contend that Milner did—or might—go to original sources, I will notice these two points before I offer a more general statement on the subject. First, then, what do we mean—or what

tude of his capacity was almost unbounded; his judgment was sound and correct; his discernment acute and penetrating. To such a man scarcely anything appeared impossible; the very difficulties with which a subject was invested offered a strong temptation to him to encounter it; and what he thought worthy of his efforts he never relinquished till he had surmounted every obstacle, and made his victory complete." (Pearson in Scott's *Vind.* p. 10.) I am sure I thought I was doing what was not merely fair, but advantageous, to Joseph Milner, in taking the Dean's edition, and giving the work credit for all that had proceeded from the joint talents of both. I said in my first letter "I say *Milner*, without pretending to decide to which of the brothers we ought to attribute some part of this repetition and error; nor is it of consequence, as we are speaking with reference to the History in general, and no one, I presume, will affirm that Joseph Milner's collections were the worse for being looked over and edited by the Dean." p. 51. I little thought of the turn which things would take; and that the next defence of Milner would quarrel with me for unjustly imputing to him, the faults and prejudices of the meddling Dean. Your remark, however, is obviously founded on the supposition, or the affectation of assuming that my only object was to vilify Joseph Milner; and that, therefore, if any nonsense or error in the book, could be shewn not to have been actually written by him, my "attempt to *convert* it into a fault," would of course become quite ridiculous. I have already said that you seem to have no idea of any man's writing on any controverted topic except for some object beyond, or beside, the establishment of truth, and there is quite enough in your pamphlet to make one believe, that the motive which you would most naturally suspect in others would be party or personal hostility—but whether you have a right to exhibit me on your title-page as a derider and mocker of Milner, to call my book a "storehouse of vituperation," and to represent me to the public as writing with a view to slander the man, rather than to criticise his book, the candid reader will judge; and for such readers it is needless to offer any formal reply to a charge of which the falsehood, as well as the object, is so obvious.

did Milner mean, and what are we to understand—by “original records?” You say “Milner in speaking of ‘original records,’ “neither intended to convey all that Mr. Maitland means by “the expression, nor had he the least wish to impose upon his “readers by pretending to higher learning than he possessed. “Records absolutely *original*, respecting early periods, are, for “the most part inaccessible, even to the most diligent investigators of the productions of antiquity.” Really, Sir, unless you mean to avail yourself of an unworthy quibble on the word *original*, which you have printed in italics, your statement is most untrue. Are the books of Moses, of Herodotus, or of Livy, more inaccessible than Stackhouse’s History of the Bible, or Mitford’s Greece, or Hook’s Roman History? Is any one of these books more out of the reach of any man who should think of becoming a historian, than another? And at all events, if he has “neither time nor facilities” for studying any of the three former, had he not better refrain from undertaking to correct the latter? But, will any man really pretend that a historian of the fourth century cannot as easily get the works of the Gregories, Hilary, Basil, &c. as Fleury’s History, and Cave’s *Apostolici*? You know that I never blamed Milner for not having read the autograph manuscripts of the Fathers; and as you say that by “original records” he never “intended to convey all” that I mean by the expression, I will beg you clearly to state what you think he did intend to convey by the words. In the mean time, I will briefly mention what I understand, and suppose to be meant, by the expression. It is obvious to every reflecting person, and should be familiar to all those who read (especially all those who write, or write about) History, that there are only two sources from whence it can be derived. These may be termed *primary*, and *secondary*, or *original* and *subsidiary*. The former of these sources may be again divided into two classes—the first, those who wrote from the testimony of their own senses, or that public contemporary knowledge which cannot appeal to, but is the foundation of, record—the second, those who, though not eye witnesses or contemporaries, do yet state facts, either

on the authority of earlier works no longer extant, or on some other authority which we cannot trace. These are, as it respects us, original or primary sources (though of a lower order) because we have not the means of tracing the matters which they relate to any earlier authority. It is, then, to such writers that I understand a historian to refer, when he proposes to go to *original* sources; especially if those terms are used in direct contradistinction from "modern historians;" who form, of course, the secondary, or subsidiary, source from whence history may be derived.

Secondly—in a particular case you insinuate that Milner did go to original sources; or, at least cannot be proved not to have done so. In speaking of this case you seem to understand perfectly well what I meant by going to *original* records; and as we really seem to differ here also as to the nature of the proof to be required, and the principles by which discussion should be regulated, I feel it necessary to say a few words respecting it. Henry, in his History of England, stated certain facts, and gave as his authority, "W. Neubrig. l. 2. c. 13. Item p. 631. J. Brompt. col. 1050." Milner having related the same facts, gave as his authority, "Neubrig. Brompt. Collect. See Henry's Hist. of Eng. Vol. III. p. 240." Having never found reason to believe that Milner had seen the works of William of Newbury, or John Brompton, or any other writer whatever of the class to which they belong, I felt—and I still feel—morally certain that he did not understand the reference; and thought that the word *col.* referred to some *collection*, with which he was unacquainted; and left out the "1050," because he did not know what to make of it. You however say—"But why, it is asked, did Milner rely on Henry, and not apply himself to *original sources* for information? That he obtained his facts, *in the first instance*, from Henry, is clear; but it is *not to be inferred*, that he neglected to compare that author with the *originals*. If Milner had desired to appear learned at the expense of truth, he would carefully have avoided those mistakes, for which he is most unsparingly con-

“demned. The reference to William of Newbury, which furnishes Mr. Maitland with repeated occasions for something rather like banter than sober censure, would have been much more carefully copied, had the writer wished to *shine in borrowed plumes*. That he was careless in marking down his authorities, even where he had not been careless in consulting them, I allow—and this fault, I state, once for all, pervades his whole work. Yet the very negligence which I have no wish to excuse, exonerates him from the charge* of an ostentatious display of erudition.” p. 46. Now, Sir, without any banter, I will ask you, with all the seriousness of “sober censure;”—Do you believe that Milner after reading the history and the reference, went to Twysden’s *Decem Scriptores* (to which there was nothing in Henry’s reference to guide him) and having picked out John Brompton’s *Chronicle*, and read the specified 1050th *column*, he made a reference in such terms as “Neubrig. Brompt. Collect.” without any number at all? and that having also read William of Newbury’s account of the matter, he referred to the two writers in so unintelligible a manner? *Do you believe this?* I ask you pointedly and plainly, for it seems quite impossible; and to me your suggestion looks too much like that desperate and unprincipled advocacy which takes refuge in some extravagant possibility, and calls for proof where, from the nature of things, proof is impossible. I cannot prove that Milner did not read John Brompton’s *Chronicle*, nor can I prove that he did not set it to music, and sing it to George the Third; but, I quite as much believe that he did the one, as the other; and I am convinced that all persons, who are in any degree capable of judging will do the same. It is quite impossible, Sir, to reply to your suggestion with gravity; and my reason for noticing it is, that we may come to some understanding of principles. You plainly insinuate that in this case Milner looked out these references—can you, I repeat, conscientiously declare that *you believe it?*

* Who ever made such a charge? And how far is it honest to pass over charges plainly made, and insinuate charges which are not made?

What is contained in my second letter to Mr. Rose seems to me, as I have already said, quite sufficient to settle the question of original and secondary sources; but I there stated that if any of the friends of Milner should think otherwise, I should be happy to go through any other century, prior to the *thirteenth*, in the same way. Instead, however, of naming any period for farther investigation, you take no notice of what I have already said of the *fourth* century—but I will, to save trouble, and to shew more clearly what I mean by this proposition, make one remark respecting the whole history of all those centuries—of all that intervening period of 800 years from A.D. 400 to A.D. 1200.

I believe that in writing the history of those centuries Milner did see—at least I do not dispute that he might see—the following writers who may be said to be original;

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Vth. Century. | Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret, as far as they lasted, which was not half way—Evagrius—Jerome—Augustine—perhaps Chrysostom. |
| VIth. ——— | Evagrius—perhaps Fulgentius and Gregory. |
| VIIth. ——— | None |
| VIIIth. ——— | Bede. |
| IXth. ——— | None. |
| Xth. ——— | None. |
| XIth. ——— | None. |
| XIIth. ——— | Bernard. |

Except these I believe that Milner never referred to any original author whatever in writing the history of eight hundred years. I give this however, only as my belief, with a full consciousness that I may have overlooked one or two original writers, or may have been mistaken respecting others. At the same time I would not make such a statement without having taken some trouble to enable myself to form an opinion, and feeling almost certain that there can be no error materially affecting the argument. Should any one think my opinion incorrect, it will be easy for him to turn to Milner, to judge for himself, and to name the authors whom I have omitted. It may be said, that in some cases he has a whole chapter on a single author,

and his works; and that in most of the centuries, he devotes a chapter to the writers of the period, and professedly gives extracts from their works. I know this—and am perfectly aware that it would be easy to gather, from his history of this period, forty or fifty names of writers, who are mentioned in such a way as that any stranger might suppose Milner to have seen them; and of some of whom he speaks in such terms that one could never think of doubting it; but I am, notwithstanding, persuaded that he did not use any of them—that he knew them only by report of others, and extracted from them only at second hand. If you can disprove this, do so; if not, I think I have proved the proposition.

II. *That compiling from modern writers—generally from such as he disagreed with, in feeling, in doctrine, and in many matters of opinion—without examining their authorities—he was frequently affected* by their mistakes, or prejudices,—and generally confined to their defective statements.*

1. He compiled from modern historians—You say that Milner was not “in any sense a mere compiler.” Unless you mean to lay such a stress upon the word “mere,” as would amount to a complete quibble (for of how few authors can it be said in the strictest sense of the term that they are *mere* compilers) we are directly at issue. I should say that, so far as I have examined his work, and the sources from whence he obtained his information, it is one of the merest compilations that I have ever seen. This however may be easily put to the test; and, after so bold an assertion, I hope you will either adopt a very simple mode of trial which I offer, or suggest a better. Take the third volume which contains the history of seven out of the eight centuries just mentioned—let it fall open at hazard three times, and each time take the two pages which are open, the two which precede, and the two which follow them—and, unless you hit upon the apology for Christian missions, I shall be surprised if three pages out of the eighteen turn out to be what can be called, in any sense whatever, original.

In the mean time I will give a list of those books which

it appears to me that Milner may have used in writing the history of these eight hundred years. I may have overlooked some references, and he may have used some books without referring to them, but I cannot think that the list is materially incorrect or defective. I do not intend to pledge myself that he did actually use all these books and merely mean that I find their names in his margin and do not dispute, that he may have done so—

Fleury's Ecclesiastical History
 Dupin's Ecclesiastical Writers—the English translation
 The Magdeburg Centuriators
 Butler's Lives of the Saints
 Mosheim's Institutes—generally in the translation
 Bower's Lives of the Popes
 Warner's Ecclesiastical History of England
 Collier's Ecclesiastical History
 Hume's History of England
 Gibbon's Decline and Fall
 Cave's Apostolici
 Fox's Martyrs
 Berington's History of Abelard
 Jansen's Augustine
 Newton on the Prophecies
 Bruce's Travels
 Nicholls on the Common Prayer
 Newcome's History of the Abbey of St. Alban's
 Cæsar's Commentaries
 Allix on the Churches of Piedmont
 Edwards on Free Will
 Butler's Analogy
 Burnet on the Articles
 Puffendorf's History of Sweden.

Of these books, the five first were the principal sources. Having analysed a considerable part of the second and third volumes, I feel authorised to say, that the work is, as to *history*, very little more than an abridgement of Fleury; and I must add (for I have shewn and shall have farther occasion to shew) very carelessly made. As to *biography*, if the subject was one of the Apostolici, Cave—if a writer, Dupin—if a canonized

saint, Alban Butler, was applied to for some account of his life; Dupin also furnishing extracts (that is an English translation, of his French translation, of what he thought fit to extract) from their works if they had written any; and the Centuriators adding little extracts in the original (when that is Latin) common-placed under different heads. Beside this the centuriators occasionally contributed small quantities of history, biography, and remark; and so did the other works in the list which I have given, and which appear to have been more or less referred to. To none of them however was Milner indebted to anything like the amount that he was to the five which I have just specified; and of them he owed by far the most to Fleury. It is indeed wonderful to see such a list of books brought together for such an undertaking as Milner's—but I am merely stating that, so far as I can judge, after all that has been said of original sources he did actually make his history of eight hundred years from these books, without consulting any original writers except the very few whom I have mentioned in the preceding proposition; and that he wrote the history of several centuries without referring to any original writer at all.

This statement may appear to some, not only to contradict the general assertions alluded to respecting original records, and penetrating recesses of private history unknown to his predecessors; but also as inconsistent with specific statements respecting certain authors of whom Milner speaks, and to whom he refers in terms which would lead one to suppose that he was quoting from the original. I think that, in my second letter to Mr. Rose, I have given instances which may shew that we must not too hastily decide from some expressions which would seem to imply this, if used by other writers. As however you taunt me with a paucity of materials, I will give a new illustration of my meaning from the history of the fifth century.

“At Typasa, the Secretary of Cirila was ordained Bishop by the Arians. The inhabitants seeing this, transported themselves into Spain, as the distance was but small: some, who could meet with no vessels, remained in Africa. The new Bishop laboured by courtesy to win their favour; but they, in contempt of his ministry, assembled themselves in

a private house for public worship. Huneric hearing of this by a message from the Bishop, ordered their tongues to be cut out and their right hands to be cut off, in the public market-place. He seems to have permitted them to retire to Constantinople, but to have been determined to prevent their open confession of the Trinity. Shall I, in compliance with modern prejudices, throw a veil over the rest, or shall I proceed according to historical veracity?—*IMPERIOSA TRAHIT VERITAS*. A miracle followed, worthy of God, whose majesty had been so daringly insulted, and which must at that time have much strengthened the hearts of the faithful, who needed indeed some peculiar consolations amidst such scenes of horrible persecution. The miracle itself is so well attested, that I see not how it can be more so. The reader shall have both the fact and its proofs. Though their tongues were cut out to the root, they spake as well as before. 'If any one doubt the fact, says Victor of Vita, let him go to Constantinople, where he will find a sub-deacon called *REPARATUS*, one who was thus treated, who speaks plainly, and who has a particular respect shewn him in the palace of the Emperor Zeno, especially by the Empress.'

Æneas, of Gaza, a platonian philosopher, a cautious and prudent person, was at that time at Constantinople, and writes thus in the conclusion of his dialogue on the resurrection: 'I myself saw them, heard them speak, and wondered, that their utterance could be so articulate. I searched for the organ of speech, and not trusting my ears, was resolved to have the proof of the eyes. Causing them to open their mouths, I saw that their tongues were plucked out even by the roots, and was then more surprised that they could live, than that they could speak.' Is this sufficient evidence? Hear more: Procopius, the historian, in his history of the Vandalic War,* says, Huneric ordered the tongues of many to be cut out, who were afterwards seen in the streets of Constantinople when I was there, talking without any impediment, or feeling any inconvenience from what they had suffered. Count Marcellinus, in his *Chronicon*, says, 'I have seen some of this company of faithful Confessors at Constantinople, who had their tongues cut out, but spake nevertheless without any imperfection in their utterance.' To name only one more witness: the great Emperor Justinian, in a Constitution published by him for Africa, after it had fallen into his dominion, testifies, that he had beheld the same.† Vol. II. p. 505.

Now here is no reference to any modern historian—and for five or six pages before, and four or five after, there is no such reference. There is, as far as I see, nothing to lead any person who should come to the work as a stranger, to doubt that Milner

* B. 1. c.viii.

† B. 1. Cod. de Off. Afr.

had actually compiled this evidence from the original works of the authors whom he cites. With Mr. Scott's voucher that he "constantly had recourse to the original documents" who could doubt that he had done so in this case? The original, and most important writer, for the history of the Vandalic persecution is, without doubt, Victor Vitensis; and from the way in which Milner speaks of him, in particular, one would naturally suppose that he was making use of his work. He says, "Victor, Bishop of Vita, to whom, as an eye witness and fellow sufferer, we are indebted for the history of this remarkable persecution" &c. p. 499. "One of these was Victor, our author, who" &c. p. 500. "If any one doubt the fact, says Victor of Vita, let him &c." p. 506 "Victor, of Vita, of whose affecting history of the African persecutions, I have made much use" p. 548. Yet, on turning to Fleury, we find the history so exactly the same—we so completely trace Milner up to, and through, and beyond, this story—that it would be absurd to affect to doubt that in this as well as in what precedes and follows, he was transcribing from the modern historian. There is, I think, sufficient evidence of this, which I should like to give in detail; and nothing prevents my doing so but the space which it would occupy. I am, however, quite prepared to do it if necessary; and in the mean time, it may be sufficient to observe, that when I find Milner coming regularly to this matter in a transcript from Fleury—giving just exactly what Fleury does, and no more; except one single sentence which appears to have arisen from his not having a clear idea of what he was copying—giving no reference (as Fleury gave him none) to the work which few persons who have read it would be likely to call Marcellinus's "Chronicons"—and giving the unintelligible reference "B. 1. Cod. de Off. Afr." for the testimony of Justinian—when I see this I think I may infer, and I am convinced that all capable and impartial persons will infer, that Milner took the matter from the modern history, and not from the original record. Your mode of advocacy may permit you to insinuate (as in the case of John Brompton) that, guided by the modern historian,

he went to the original—that he read Lib. 1. tit. xxvii. of the Justinian Code, “*De Officio Praefecti Praetorio Africae* ;” and then gave the reference which stands in his work—but I think most people will agree with me in supposing, that he took the reference from Fleury’s margin where it stands. “*L. 1. Cod. de Off. P. P. Afr.*”—only, not knowing what was meant by the *P.P.* he left out that part of it.

The point however to be observed on the present occasion is, that Milner here copied from the modern historian, without giving any reference to him ; and that he did it in a way from which the reader would naturally suppose that he was quoting the original record. It is for this purpose, and as a specimen of this, that I here notice it ; but, having done so, I cannot forbear adding, that he seems to have depended entirely for his account of these martyrs—one of the most curious facts in the whole history of the church, and one which the historian of “the real church” was surely bound to investigate closely and to relate fully—on two authors whose credit he had tried to ruin very particularly on the precise point of martyrology. I think no one will pretend that he went to any writers but Fleury and Gibbon ; and of them he had, on another occasion, said ;

* “I give this story at some length, because it has sufficient marks of credibility, and is supported by the evidence of Augustine. I cannot go on with Fleury in various other stories. *He seems ready to believe every thing, Gibbon to believe nothing, in subjects of martyrology.* Whatever judgment they may be possessed of, it remains in both equally unexercised ; indiscriminate incredulity being as blind a thing as indiscriminate belief. It is the duty of a reasonable creature to discern and to distinguish ; this requires labour and judgment. Fleury’s method needs only the former, Gibbon’s neither the one nor the other.*

If this be true, it should go near to “ruin the credit” of these authors ; to one of whom at least, Milner was incalculably indebted. Perhaps I have said enough to prove that Milner transcribed from modern writers—if not further proof will be furnished in the discussion of other points.

* I. 503. First Ed. It may amuse the reader to see how this passage was modified by the Dean. Vol. I. p. 472. Ed. of 1816.

2. The authors from whom Milner transcribed were persons with whom he disagreed in feeling, in doctrine, and in many matters of opinion—To your statement that he was not a mere compiler you add, “At the same time he does not attempt to eclipse the labours of others; he takes a field which they had left open; and whatever particular occasions of blame he find in Mosheim or in other writers, he does not, like Mr. Maitland, try to ruin the credit of those from whom he differs in opinion” p. 81. On this statement I must be allowed to make a few observations; because it contains more error and misrepresentation than I should have supposed it possible to crowd into so small a space.

In the first place to talk of Milner’s taking a field which others had left open is too ridiculous to require any answer, after what has just been said—a barn which they had left open, would have been a more correct figure.

Secondly—your affecting to make a merit of Milner’s not setting to work formally and avowedly to ruin the credit of those on whom he was depending with almost blind confidence, is as amusing as your comparison. Was I indebted to Milner’s industry, copying his references into my margin, living from hand to mouth on his labours? Was I, in short, circumstanced with respect to him, as he was with respect to Fleury, Dupin, Cave and Butler? But do you mean that, if Milner thought his predecessors ought not to be credited, it was meritorious to suppress that belief? and that, if I thought Milner ought not to be credited, it was a sin to say so, for fear I should ruin that credit which I thought he ought not to have? I wish I could understand the system of expediency.

Thirdly—you charge me with trying to ruin the credit of those who differ from me “in opinion.” I thought that my difference with Milner as to the Waldenses had respected a matter of *fact*; and that there was truth on one side, and not on the other. So I had called it,* and I thought it was what must seem a most important matter of fact to the followers of

* See before, p. 4.

Milner. The question of fact amounts to almost ;—Whether, during a long period the church of Christ existed, or to say the least, visibly existed, or not. Milner says that sects (or as he makes them one sect) having to my mind a very questionable appearance, not only formed a part of the “real church;” but that at one time, so far as he knows, there was no other real church in the world. The question (to state it in his own terms, which seem to me rather strange) appears to be—whether salvation by the grace of Christ existed, or not, during that period.* Mr. Faber, in wonderful opposition to history and common sense—but in defence of a system which requires him to declare war against both—tells us that from the year 604, to this very day, there have always been two “whole churchès,” within the limits of the Western Roman Empire, which have “eminently, and in their corporate capacity *as churches*” testified against the demonolatrous apostacy of the church of Rome, and that the Albigenses and Waldenses answer to this description. Is this a matter of opinion, or a matter of fact? Really, you should call things by their right names; or else, in your zeal to ruin my credit, you will very seriously injure your own.

Fourthly—I must distinctly contradict your statement that Milner does not “try to ruin the credit of those from whom he differs in opinion.” It is true, and I have already admitted it, that he does not in a formal systematic way (like your’s) set about ruining the credit of those on whom almost exclusively he depended for *facts*, and with whom therefore he had the common sense not to dispute about anything but *opinions*,

* “Real christians were still to be found only among the Waldenses, or else they worshipped God in obscurity, under the unspeakable disadvantages of the general corruption..... The Church of God, therefore, considered as a Society, seems only to have existed among the people whose history has been related above”—and a note adds “Waldenses.” IV. 63, 64. “The Waldenses are the middle link, which connects the primitive christians and Fathers with the reformed; and, *by their means, the proof is completely established*, that salvation by the grace of Christ, felt in the heart, and expressed in the life by the power of the Holy Ghost, has ever existed from the time of the Apostles till this day.” III. 511.

unless indeed it happened that they differed among themselves as to any particular facts. As to facts he evidently did not think these writers unworthy of credit, or he would not have followed them so closely and implicitly; but yet I must say that I know of no writer who so frequently indulges in contemptuous reference to his predecessors. Just turn back to the extracts which I have given on p. 18 and 19, and say whether they would not convey to any mere reader of Milner, an idea that all previous histories of the Christian Church were worth little, in comparison of that which he had written, or was going to write—say whether the “credit” of other ecclesiastical historians would not be more likely to be ruined by the light in which both Joseph Milner and the Dean have placed them, and by general and supercilious reference to their works, than it would have been by disputing any particular facts which they may have related. What do you think of such a sweeping censure as—“But it is not the practice of *modern writers* to be candid in their judgment of the ancient christians” (Vol. I, p. 549) Or take an example including both the brothers;—“Mr. Joseph Milner, in his introduction to the first volume of this history, *complains of the ecclesiastical historians*, that *they* had developed, with a studious particularity, the intricacies and intrigues of popery; that the connexion between the church and state had afforded very ample materials of *what is commonly called Church History*; but that learning and philosophy had been much more respected than godliness and virtue. A treatment of this sort was to be expected from deistical historians; but that the same lamentable truth should be exemplified in the writings of those who believe christianity, and are bound to support its cause, is discouraging and vexatious in the highest degree. The fact, however, is not to be denied.” IV. *pref. p. x.* What is the general impression likely to be made on most readers by such statements as these? Beside this, however, there are I think scarcely any, if any, writers to whom Milner is much indebted, of whom personally and in particular he does not say what would be

likely to go a good way towards ruining their credit with the class of persons who were likely to read his history.

3. He transcribed from these writers without examining their authorities. It can scarcely be necessary to offer any proof on this head; but I notice it because I wish it to be clearly understood that I do not blame Milner for reading Fleury, Dupin, or any other writer whom he read; nor do I mean that he ought to have read only such writers as agreed with him in opinion. Such a mode, if in this case it had been practicable, could only have led to ill consequences. To read them was well, to gather the knowledge of subjects and sources from them was certainly wise, but to rely on them—to write on the authority of men whom he did not believe to understand the subject on which he was attempting to get information from them, and whom he would with perhaps scarcely more than a single exception have called unevangelical—to expect that he could in any way supply their defects by transcribing from their works, without going to their authorities—this seems to me strange and absurd. Indeed I cannot imagine how any man could be contented to go on so long as Milner did, reading, and copying from, books which perpetually refer to original sources, without feeling that he must either go to those sources, or abandon his design. Take, for instance, the history of the Vandalic persecution, to which I have just referred—when he learned that there was an account of it, written by an eye witness and a sufferer, must he not have felt some desire to see the original? You tell me that “he had neither time nor facilities”—but surely you do not mean to say that, having voluntarily engaged in the undertaking, and arrived at so curious and interesting a part of it, he could not have found “time” to run through the work of Victor Vitensis, which is not so large as your pamphlet. But he had not “facilities”—what are “facilities?” If I had a brother, the Head of a House in Cambridge, or in Oxford, I should think *that* a great “facility” for seeing, or getting accurate and well-authenticated extracts from, any book in existence. I cannot imagine that Milner might not have begged or borrowed, (I do not say

that he should have stolen) Dom. Ruinart's *Historia Persecutionis Vandalicæ*, a truly Benedictine book, containing the text of Victor, and five hundred pages of additional matter, and learned comment. Even supposing that he had been unable to get it in any other way, and had been forced to buy it, it seems to me not impossible that he might, at that time, have got it for half a crown, and sold it again for two shillings, when he had done with it—at least, I know that my copy, which (except one damaged leaf) is a very good one, cost me three shillings. But really this talk about “time and facilities” is mere trifling; and would not be worth noticing at all if it did not contain a distinct admission, that whatever might be the *qualifications* of Milner, his *circumstances* were such as to render his undertaking such a task quite absurd.

As to the fact, however, that Milner copied from the modern historians, without looking at the authorities to which they refer, I consider it as quite sufficiently proved; but one case occurs to me, which I have already alluded to (but without stating it, and therefore, perhaps, not very intelligibly) in my first letter to Mr. Rose. At first sight it looks very much like the reference to John Brompton and Henry's History of England, of which I have had occasion to speak several times—it is “Ingulph's Hist. See Collier's Eccl. Hist. I. Vol.” and it stands in the third volume of Milner, p. 221, being the authority which he gives for his account of the martyrdom of a bishop of Utrecht. Lest you should here suggest, as in the former case, that guided by the modern historian, Milner went to the original, I must observe that Ingulphus (as indeed the writer, and the corrector, of a history of that period might have supposed, even if Collier had erroneously cited him for it) says nothing about the matter. The reference to Ingulphus in Collier belongs to the preceding paragraph, which contains matter relating to the Abbey of Croyland; but, being printed in the side margin, and beginning only even with *the end* of that paragraph, it runs down by the side of the beginning of the next, which Milner quotes, and which has, in like manner, its own authority at *the end*. Fleury,

from whom Milner was perhaps most in the habit of copying, very commonly put his marginal authority at the beginning of his paragraphs, and this perhaps led to the mistake; but that Milner actually went to Ingulphus, and found what was never there, is, I suppose, more than even you will maintain or insinuate. I know not whether my description makes the matter clear; but it will be plain enough if you turn to p. 154 of the first volume of Collier's History.

4. From this mode of proceeding Milner was frequently affected by the mistakes and prejudices of those from whom he copied.

Perhaps I cannot give a better instance than the case of the Paulicians; in which my having been deceived by the reference as to the mode in which Milner came by a very gross mistake, seems to have afforded you matter for great triumph, I acknowledge that when I saw "Concil. Lab. Nic. Ep. xiv." at the bottom of the page, I did suppose (for I did not then know his work so well as I do now) that he had read and misunderstood the epistle of Pope Nicolas referred to. I did not then know of any modern writer who had made the mistake;* and it did not seem to me impossible, that by the time when Milner had got into the *ninth* century, he might have opened a book which should have been at his elbow all along. You tell me, however, that instead of going to the Councils, or looking at the Pope's letter at all, Milner was copying from a work written for

* I did not even know that anybody before Milner had attempted to vindicate the character of the Paulicians, when I wrote the passage referred to; nor indeed was I aware of it until I was informed by my friend Mr. Dowling, who knows more about them than I ever did, that the honour, or whatever it was, belongs to Godfrey Arnold. It does not, however, appear that he supposed the Pope, or the Pope's letter, to have had anything to do with the persecution. But the Paulicians belong to the Albigenian part of your pamphlet, which I hope to notice another time. In the meanwhile you will, perhaps, feel it necessary to take some notice of Mr. Dowling's "Letter on the Opinions of the Paulicians," in which some of the statements which you have put forth are so ably and completely (though by anticipation) contradicted and exposed.

party and for bread, by an unprincipled ex-Jesuit, who had made the mistake—if indeed in his case it was not a wilful lie. The case however as to our present purpose stands thus:—Milner tells me that Pope Nicolas persecuted the Paulicians, and proves it, by a certain letter of that Pope—I say that the Pope had nothing to do, and the letter had nothing to do, with the Paulicians—Right enough, you reply, but if you had gone to the first edition you would have seen (what the Dean thought it quite as well that the readers of the corrected edition should not see)* that the original historian never went near the Pope's

* I feel warranted in this suggestion by the Dean's proceeding in the business, which is really curious; and that he should have done it, and you should point it out, surprises me. True it is that in the first edition (Vol. III. p. 222) Joseph Milner very fairly gave his authority. The passage stands thus, "In a letter he highly approved her conduct, and admired her following the documents of the Holy See.* So truly was Antichristian tyranny now established at Rome!" The asterisk refers to "Bower's History of the Popes," at the bottom of the page. When this passage came to be subjected to the additions and correction of the Dean he inserted into the text (Vol. III. p. 208, 209.) where the asterisk had stood, *a whole page more* from Bower almost verbatim—struck out *his name*—and gave instead "Porphyrog." and "Concil. Lab. Nic. Ep. xiv." Do you believe that the Dean went to these authorities? or that he got "Porphyrog." from Bower's text, which he has slightly changed, and thrown this intelligible and correct reference into the margin. Compare these words of Bower with Milner's,—“What Theodora had done to deserve such high commendation, Porphyrogennetus informs us in the following words. Theodora, he says, “resolved to bring the Paulicians; *a sect of heretics*, to the true faith.” The Dean you will perceive slightly changed the form of the sentence, and (perhaps to avoid the necessity of explanation) omitted the ‘*litigated words*,’ which I have marked by italics. The rest of the paragraph is, I believe, verbatim from Bower; and with no variation, except that the marks of quotation should be at the end of it, instead of after the word “drowned.” In the next paragraph, I am not aware of any variations but these;—For Bower's, “And to this bloody massacre the Pope alluded in commending,” the Dean says, “The Pope alluded to this bloody massacre when he commends”—in the same line he inserts the words “in the same letter”—in the next line he remits “*Domino cooperante*,” from the text to the margin—a few lines lower he changes, “I cannot help observing,” into “I am not disposed to suppress;” and, “spoken of above,” into “just mentioned;” and (what, except the omission of

letter, but was copying out of Bower's *Lives of the Popes*. This seems to me to be a very odd way of defending Milner; but at all events the case furnishes a strong instance of Milner's being misled by following a modern and prejudiced guide, without going to his authority.

Porphyrog's testimony that the Paulicians were heretics, is the only variation of the slightest consequence,) he changes "documents" into "directions." This is, however, an important alteration. Joseph Milner had said (as I have just quoted) that the Pope "admired her for following the *documents* of the Holy See." This sentence, which immediately precedes the passage inserted from Bower by the Dean, he has altered thus—"admired her on account of her *implicit obedience* to the Holy See;" and now, in this passage of Bower, he changes "documents" into "directions." I said, in commenting on the passage, when I suppose, that Milner had translated it from the original, "I need hardly observe how unfair it is to translate 'dogmata,' by 'directions';" (First Letter, p. 25.) but it now appears as if Dean Milner had altered Bower's translation, without any authority whatever. One cannot suppose a man educated as a Jesuit (whether, or not, he was, as he affirmed, a professor in three universities, and a counsellor of the Inquisition,) not to have known that he was straining a point in translating "dogmata" by "documents"; but to change that into "directions," and to represent the Pope as declaring that the Empress had persecuted the Paulicians under the orders of the Holy See, was what Bower (who was not modest) would scarcely have ventured upon. I do not mean to insinuate, for I have not the least idea, that the Dean meant to deceive in making this alteration; in which I suppose that he only intended to make the matter more plain, by giving a better word. He was not, I dare say, aware that it was the word of a Jesuit, who had gone as far as he could in saying "documents;" for which, I doubt not, had he been challenged, he would have found some quibbling defence. But what are we to say to the whole business of this "addition and correction?"—the addition being a page from Bower's *History*; and the correction, the erasure of his name. I wish I knew how I ought to feel, when, after discovering such proceedings, I read the Dean's statement that "the compositions of Mr. Milner, whether already published or yet in manuscript, are *most perfectly* free from plagiarism. "He profited by his immense reading; but neither his thoughts nor his expressions are to be traced in books; unless indeed in the case of "some short and pithy favourite sentiment or sentence, which had "forcibly struck his mind." *Life prefixed to his Sermons*, lx. Whether this is true or not, is another matter—I quote it here merely as coming from the Dean,

Still farther, however, to illustrate this point, I will give another instance. Among those "who had the greatest reputation for piety" in the twelfth century, Milner tells us,—

"Meginher, archbishop of Treves, is a character, of whom it were to be wished we had a more distinct account. He inveighed against the luxury and sensuality of his clergy, and so provoked their resentment, that he was obliged to undertake a journey to Rome in his own defence. By the treachery of his own clergy he was intercepted on the road, and died in prison at Parma in the year 1130. If we had the particulars of these transactions, it is probable that he would appear to have resembled Chrysostom in his integrity, as well as in his sufferings. Meginher deserves, however, to be mentioned, because his case evinces how unsafe it was in those days to defend christian piety, even in the midst of the visible church of Christ." III. 432.

I believe that I do Milner no injustice, if I say that all he knew of Meginher was obtained from a brief notice of him—scarcely more than half as long as the extract which I have just given from his own work—which he found in that part of the *Centuriators* to which he refers, "Cent. XII. 23." He elsewhere professed to be aware of the prejudice of these writers against the Church of Rome,* which is, to be sure, barefaced enough; but yet he does not seem to have perceived that they had fastened on, and extracted, this scrap from Trithemius because it testified the existence of lewd priests. Milner whose design was (I may almost say) opposite to theirs, but who fell upon this passage in their work, saw nothing in the story but a good bishop who rebuked a scandalous clergy. I believe he had so relied on misrepresentations of those times, and was in fact so

* "That association of ideas, which Mr. Locke describes, and which has been in all ages a powerful source of error and absurdity, both in principles and practice, accounts for the acrimonious expressions with which Protestant writers have too often indulged themselves in the relation of matters connected with the See of Rome.—The *Magdeburgian Centuriators* seem, by their treatment of the character of Boniface, to have largely imbibed this prejudice." III. 183. I acknowledge—indeed we see in this very case of Meginher—that Milner followed the *Centuriators* with implicit confidence; but may I enquire whether such a remark had not a tendency to "ruin their credit?"

contrary, I brought the proof, and illustration, of what I said from his history of the *tenth century*. Why did you entirely overlook it? You may, perhaps, answer that your sole undertaking was to shew that I had told lies, and made mistakes; and that as I had done neither in my account of Milner's history of the Tenth Century, it would have been out of your way to say anything about the matter. But such an answer, though it may be very true, will scarcely satisfy those who admire Milner's History, or those who impartially seek after truth; and, indeed, I cannot avoid or conceal the belief that you passed by what I said because you could not answer it. You must, however, use your own discretion; but that part of the book was brought to my mind just now, by its affording another instance of Milner's falling into error by implicitly, and without enquiry, following the Centuriators. He says, "That the true doctrines of the Gospel, and some true knowledge of their experimental use and power, were not lost in the church altogether, the following quotations will abundantly evince; though of the authors themselves no particular account can be given, nor is it very clear at what exact period of time some of them lived: the passages selected from them will serve, however, to shew the religious taste of the times." Vol. III. p. 273. He then gives some extracts (for which he very fairly refers to the Centuriators) from *five* writers; of one of whom he had just said that it was uncertain whether he lived in the tenth or eleventh century, but that it is of no great consequence, because "the spirit and taste of the tenth and eleventh centuries, are so similar, that what illustrates the one will illustrate the other" p. 271. You might justly charge me with foolishly wishing that Milner had wasted his time about minute and trivial questions, if I censured him for not having fixed the precise date of all these writers; and with injustice if I made much of his placing Theophylact in the eleventh instead of the tenth century; but what if neither of the other four belonged to the *tenth* century? and if, supposing that one could be placed in the *eleventh* century, the other three must be distributed between the 8th, 9th, and 12th? * To be sure, it matters very little when

they lived; but they are brought together "to give the reader an idea of the state of true religion in *these times*," which Milner professes to have been his "chief view in this chapter." I notice it here, however, as an instance of erroneous statement arising from his copying the errors, and being misled by the prejudices of the modern writers. That this was the case very frequently, I have perhaps sufficiently proved—if not I am prepared with farther evidence—but how could it be otherwise, copying as he did from papists, infidels, and party writers; and scarcely ever gleaning a single fact, or sentence, from any man whom he considered as at all like-minded with himself—not as to any shade of opinion respecting election, or justification, but—as to what was or was not religion?

5. Thus compiling from modern writers, Milner was not only frequently affected by their mistakes and prejudices but generally confined to their defective statements. It is strange, considering his design and his professions, that he should have borrowed from them, to any great extent, even that which might seem to suit his purpose; but it is more strange that when they told him where they learned what they knew, of persons whom

* As to Gislebertus, (or as he might as well have been called Gilbert) the Centuriators ingenuously confess that they do not know whether the work which they quote belonged to him, or when it was written, but that they put it into that century because it was almost destitute of such things. "*Seculo hoc inseruimus scriptum: cum alioqui non modo præstantioribus; sed etiam mediocribus, destituatur ecclesiæ doctoribus.*" This was certainly an odd way of giving a view of the period; and at any rate the explanation should go with the extract. But I doubt whether Milner (who got his extracts, as he tells us, at p. 78, and 139, had seen this statement at p. 353, or, at any rate their account of his doctrine, which follows in the next column of the same page;—"Veras de Christianæ doctrinæ capitibus sententias, pluribus obfuscat nævis, nam tum originale, tum actuale peccatum, post baptismum non remanere ait. Patrocinatur satisfactionibus papistarum. Septem ait peccatorum esse remissiones. Mariam prorsus ab omni peccato liberam, ac nostram deprecatricem, pronuntiat. Purgatorium præterea, et transubstantiationem in sacra cœna adstruit."

he thought worthy of particular notice, he should not have gone there to look for more information himself. Of the defects which I have hitherto noticed, this is, to say the least, one of the greatest; and to shew it in its full extent would require me to reprint volumes—but one or two examples may illustrate what I mean.

The case of Vicelinus I have already noticed.—“*All the accounts of antiquity*,” says Milner, “are full of the praises of Vicelinus; and his character is briefly, but very strongly celebrated by Mosheim, with such unqualified commendations, that I cannot but wish that very learned historian had favoured us with an abridgment of his life and actions, taken from the sources of information, which *he quotes*, but *which seem to us* inaccessible. I have consulted the Centuriators, and find matter there *sufficient to excite but not to satisfy* our curiosity. The *little to be collected from them* shall be mentioned in the next chapter. And here is an instance of that which I have had but *too frequent* occasion to remark, namely, an *extreme scantiness* of information on subjects most worthy of our researches [researches?] How willingly would the evangelical reader have excused the omission of many pages in Mosheim, if he had gratified us with an orderly account of one of the best and wisest christian missionaries of the age.” Vol. III. p. 431. I then asked, “If he had written without prejudice, could Milner have helped seeing, that such a detailed account of an individual, however excellent, was not Mosheim’s business, and that it was most particularly his own?”—*First Letter to Mr. Rose*, p. 9. You assert, however, that Milner “never had” any prejudice against Mosheim—but this is not to our present purpose.

Again—after devoting about six pages and a half to the Life of Anscarius “the Apostle of the North,” Milner adds, “I have the satisfaction to observe, that Mosheim is in the case of Anscarius, more candid than the Centuriators. He allows, that the labours of that Missionary, and in general of the other missionaries in this century, deserve the highest com-

"mendations. If it were possible to exhibit a circumstantial account of Anscarius, most probably the justice of Mosheim's encomium on his character would be ascertained beyond the reach of contradiction." (III. 242.) He adds that, "Rembert his confidant" was appointed bishop of Bremen by the dying words of the Apostle, and wrote a life of his predecessor, "which seems to have furnished historians with the greatest part of their materials concerning Anscarius." Well then, surely here was something quite in Milner's way, and quite worth his investigation. Rembert who "presided over the church of the north for twenty three years," and who "lived and died an example of piety," wrote the life of the Apostolical Prelate, who preceded him. Did Milner go to this life? No such thing—he extracted his account of Anscarius (he tells us) "from various parts of Fleury in his history of the 9th century; not without an attention also to the history of the same missionary in Alban Butler, and in the *Centur. Magd.*" Might he not have expected a more "circumstantial account" from the original work of the pious and exemplary Bishop, than he was likely to get from the defective historians on whom he relied—two of them being papists, and the Centuriators being, as he complains, in this particular case, wanting in candour and charity? This life of Anscarius by Rembert in prose, with another in verse, by Gualdo, has been published by Lambecius, in his *Origines Hamburgenses*; and again by Mabillon, in whose work these memoirs occupy forty-eight folio pages, and some of them very close-printed. In this latter work, too, Milner might have found twelve more such pages containing a life of Rembert, by a contemporary, from which he might probably have gained some addition to the meagre fourteen lines with which he dismisses a prelate who "lived and died an example of piety." Milner says, "a short fragment of an epistle to the bishops is the whole of his writings which *I can find* to be extant." p. 241. Now how far did Milner search, or did he search at all? The very commonest authorities in such cases (Cave, for instance) would have told him, that Anscarius wrote the life of Villehad,

Bishop of Bremen ; who, as Milner himself tells us, “ was called the Apostle of Saxony ;” and of whom he says, “ certainly he underwent great hazards, overcame the ferocious spirits of the infidels by his meekness, and spread among them the knowledge of the Gospel.”* And whence did Milner get his account of Villehad ? He says “ See Alban Butler, Vol. XI.” and Alban Butler in the place cited says, “ See St. Willehad’s life *“ compiled by St. Anscarius, fourth bishop of Bremen, in “ Mabillon, Annal. Bened. l. 24. §. 36. &c. and in Batavia “ Sacra, p. 85. Also Adam of Bremen, in his accurate History “ of the Archbishops of Bremen, c. 1, p. 1.” (p. 169.) Now, if Milner “ had not time or facilities” to look in either of these places, for the life of a man worthy of record, but whom (as he complained) he was obliged, “ from very confused and imperfect accounts to present to the reader,” ought he not at least to have been aware, and to have stated, that a life of him, written by Anscarius, did exist—but here is nothing of Anscarius, or Rembert, or Villehad, but what he got most completely at second hand. Let it be remembered that I do not here blame Milner for not being minute, or diffuse, on matters which he thought unworthy of attention. I am producing a case in which he did himself wish and must naturally have wished—to give a fuller account.*

Another such case is that of Adalbert, Archbishop of Prague ; of whose life he gives “ a short sketch” at Vol. III. p. 253. It consists of *forty-three lines*, in the thirty-ninth of which we read, “ Such was Adalbert ; and *so small* is the account transmitted to us of one of the wisest and best of men, whom God had raised up for the instruction of the species ;” and at p. 273, he says “ of Adalbert Archbishop of Prague, I can find no more than has been already mentioned ; though his labours deserve to have been minutely recorded.” Now what could Milner mean by saying that the account transmitted to us is so small ? What could he mean even by saying that *he could find* nothing

* Vol. III. p. 187.

but what had been mentioned? The account in Alban Butler, to which he refers, is more than *four times* as long as his sketch; and referred him to various sources of information. "See," says Butler "the two lives of St. Adalbert written soon after his death with the remarks of Henschenius. Ap. T. 3. p. 174. Also John Dlugloss, alias Longinus, Hist. Polonica, p. 112. Dithmar Chronici Lib. 4. et Chronicon Hildesheimense." Without going to any of these authorities, he might have found one of these lives collated with the other, annotated, in a word Mabillonized, in the Benedictine Acta Sanctorum,* where there are five and twenty folio pages (some of them too of the close print) which it would have been much to Milner's purpose to have read.

On this point, however, I might obviously fill a volume; but it may be sufficient, at present, to add one more instance. In his third volume (p. 296.) Milner says, "The triumphs of the Gospel in Denmark were, upon the whole, very conspicuous in this century [the eleventh.] Hear the account of Adam of Bremen, who wrote concerning the situation of this country in the year 1080. 'Look,' says he," &c. &c. Who is not curious to "hear the account" of such a writer? But when we have got on a few lines, we are told that, "for this very imperfect account" the "real church" historian is "obliged"—not to the contemporary Canon of Bremen, but—"to GIBBON." Could one have conceived it possible that he should go to such a source to get information respecting "the triumphs of the Gospel;" and then with perfect gravity, and simplicity, tell us, "For *want of materials*, I cannot dwell on the particulars of the conversion of this people." Why what materials did he expect to find in Gibbon? and who would have thought of going to such a source at all? Yet (except a note from Alban Butler) *Gibbon*, and the "elegant historian" *Hume*, are his sources; and then he complains again, "*scanty as my materials have been*" &c. What account of "the triumphs of the Gospel"

* VII. 820.

did he expect to find in the works of those infidels? People, who do not wish to be uncivil, will certainly laugh, if, in reply to the statement of such facts as these, you tell them that you "cannot but think that Mr. Maitland has never fully understood what Milner's undertaking really was, and that therefore he is unable to judge what *kind* or extent of reading the "accomplishment of it required." (p. 78.) To say nothing of its extent, is this the *kind* of reading required?

III. *That he frequently copied incorrectly—garbled—and intentionally altered what he professed to quote.*

Of all this I think I have given sufficient proofs in my *Letters* to Mr. Rose; but it may be as well to add one or two more.

1. He copied incorrectly—I have already admitted, that Milner may have seen the works of Gregory; but you will not understand me to mean, that his account of that Pope is in any degree original. On the contrary, it alone might furnish enough specimens of the incorrect copying of which I speak—but I will first notice an instance which occurs just before the account of Gregory begins. Quoting the account of John Climachus, respecting the monks in the prison of the Monastery of Mount Sinai, Milner says, "The voluntary torments they endured were amazing, and this voluntary humility of theirs continued till death." Fleury, from whom he was evidently transcribing says, "Depuis qu'ils y étoient renfermez ils n'en sortoient plus jusques à ce que Dieu fit connoître à l'abbé qu'il leur avoit pardonné;*" Milner also misrepresents the case by applying to all the prisoners that which is said of only a part, who are represented as being in a state of despair—"in their prayers they did not dare to ask to be delivered entirely from punishment;

* Liv. XXXIV. xxiv. Tom. VII. 576. Not having at present access to the original, I transcribe the Latin version from the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. "In hoc si qui post supernam vocationem deliquissent, ita eos clauderat pater, ut procedere inde nusquam valerent. Non quidem omnes simul, sed seorsum singulos, aut certe multum, duos simul ibique tam diu morabantur, quo ad eum Dominus de singulorum remissione certiores faceret."—*Tom.* III. p. 411. *Ed. Paris.* 1575.

they only begged not to be punished with the utmost rigour." John Climachus, indeed, says that there were some among them (*vidi illic animas humiles contritas*) who soliloquized in this manner; but he is contrasting them with others who were as full of hope, as these were of despair—who, "*pleni spe remissionem omnimodam inquirentes orabant*"—or as Fleury translates, "*les uns pleins d'esperance demandoient ardemment la remission de leurs pechez.*"

Proceeding, however, to the chapter on Gregory,* and considering it (for such it certainly is) as a transcript from Fleury's eighth volume and thirty-fifth book, how far is it correct? At the bottom of p. 34, "Germanus, governor of Constantinople," an officer of whom, perhaps, the reader may not have heard, is put for "Germain Prefet de Rome." (Fl. Vol. VIII. p. 2.) At p. 43 we read, "It would be tedious to recount from his Letters the instances of his liberality;" and by way of note on this passage, we find "Ep. 18. 44. 23. 57. 65. 54. 30." One would naturally suppose that Milner had collected these authorities himself; but, as he had just before referred to "Fleury, B. XXXV. c. XVI. Vol. IV." (though what the "Vol. IV." can mean I am at a loss to conceive—it is in fact Vol. VIII. p. 38) and, as in that sixteenth chapter Fleury says, "*Voici quelques exemples de ses liberalitez,*" and then proceeds to quote the very same letters, in the very same remarkable order, I cannot doubt that Milner was copying from him. I might ask whether this is "to shine in borrowed plumes"—I might ask how such a set of figures conduces "to place within the reach of the unlearned reader those pious deeds and sentiments" to which they refer—but the point to be noticed at present is, that they are not correctly given. Fleury gives the *Book* as well as the *Epistle* in each case; but Milner seems to have carelessly run his eye down the margin of two quarto pages, and (except that after 23 he omitted 37) to have taken only the Arabic numerals which he saw. In consequence he does not inform his reader, that,

* Milner, Vol. III. p. 31.

while the other letters belong to the *first* book of Gregory's epistles, that which is numbered 30, belongs to the *fourth*. The other references, at the foot of this page (which are in fact three, though printed so as to look like only two) are so mixed and disarranged that they would mislead any body who should attempt to use them; but it would take more time and trouble than it is worth, to explain the matter. On this same page, he begins an extract from a letter of Gregory, which he gives in inverted commas; but that he copied it (and very carelessly too) from Fleury, is placed beyond all doubt, by his giving Fleury's words as those of Gregory. He makes Gregory (whose words really are, "nos sacculum ecclesiæ ex lucris turpibus nolumus inquinari) say "*In general* I will not suffer the church to be defiled by base gains;" being misled by Fleury's sudden change from *quoting* the letter to *describing* it, in which he says, (p. 35.) "*En general* il lui donne cette regle: nous ne voulons point que les coffres de l'église soient souillés par des gains sordides." On the next page of Milner, (p. 45.) for "Peter Bishop of Terraco in Spain" read "of Terracina in Italy;" the mention of *Spain* having been, I presume, intended to explain the "évêque de Terracine" of Fleury, or the title of the letter "ad Petrum Episcopum Tarracinensem." On the next page, for "To Virgilius and Theodorus, bishops of Marseilles," read, as in Fleury "à Virgile *eveque d'Arles*, et a Theodore évêque de Marseille." (p. 51.) Is it necessary to follow up this examination to shew that, even in copying, Milner was singularly incorrect?

Let me then turn to an instance which I am induced to select, because it will give me an opportunity to notice a gross misrepresentation contained in the 82d page of your pamphlet. You say "Did Mr. Maitland really expect to be believed, or "did he hope to bring over one reflecting person to a favourable "view of his own side of the argument, by insinuations which "tended to put Milner's Church History on a level with the "Golden Legend?" Did he really think that the readers of "Milner only looked for certain doctrines, regarding it 'of no

"consequence whether the facts were true or false" . . . whether "it was A. or B. who was martyred, or made a bishop, at a certain time or place, if only somebody was martyred at some time, and somebody made a bishop somewhere, so as to give occasion for pious and edifying reflections?" Every person of common sense and candour will see and admit that I did not think of any such thing as putting Milner's History, and the Golden Legend, on a level; and that my object was merely to combat that argument (if it deserves the name) which maintains the intrinsic value of anything, because, "under the overruling providence of God it has been productive of good." But here you ask, in a manner which is but too much in keeping with the whole style of your pamphlet, and your letter in the British Magazine, whether I could imagine that I should "bring over" proselytes to my opinion. Can you form no idea of any other motive? but when you proceed to ask, "Did he really think that the readers of Milner only looked for certain doctrines, regarding it 'of no consequence whether the facts were true or false;'" I will answer you plainly—I did really think, and since I saw your pamphlet I am still more fully convinced, that there are some persons among the admirers of Milner, who are not desirous—nay, who are really sorry, that historical truth should be vindicated at the expence of Milner's character as a historian, and of the popularity of his book—and this, not so much because they value it *as a history*, as because it maintains and inculcates, what they consider as sound doctrine—in short, because they look upon it rather as a *theological*, than a *historical* work. What else can I understand when I find the Bishop of Calcutta styling it "one of the first works in English *theology*"*—when I find Mr. Scott asserting that it is regarded as "one of the most important *theological* works of the age,"† and adding that "this estimate is formed of it not so much by speculative persons merely from reflection on *the nature of its contents*, as by *practical* men from the actual observation of its *effects*, in bringing to a serious sense of religion those who were

* Scott's Vind. p. 27.

† Ib. p. 44.

heretofore lost in the vain pursuits of the world, and in instructing, establishing, and edifying sincere christians." Such effects Mr. Scott affirmed it had produced and was likely to produce "unless, by the rash interposition of injurious representations prejudice be excited, and the attention of ingenuous youth averted from a work, as 'worthless' and 'useless,' which might otherwise have proved highly beneficial to them, and through them to thousands yet unborn."* Surely this is coming very near to something like the suggestion, that as Milner's book is very useful as a *theological* work, it is a pity to diminish that usefulness by making known its worthlessness as a *history*. In what other view of the matter could Mr. Scott have ever thought of citing such authorities as Mr. Hey of Leeds, and Mr. Henry Thornton, or of instituting a comparison between the former of these gentlemen and Mr. Rose, simply because he "paid an attention to *theological* studies second only to that which he gave to those" of surgery?† Why else should Mr. Scott describe Mr. Rose's offence as "an official lecture to young men students of *theology*"‡—were they not also students of church history?—and was not Mr. Rose lecturing them on "the study of Church History," as Professor of Ecclesiastical History? Was it not his very business and particular duty to advertise "ingenuous" youths, as to what historians were, or were not, worth their reading? Why (for it would be absurd to affect not to understand Mr. Scott's language) should a censure of Milner be "heard as little less than a DECLARATION OF WAR," against the evangelical party? Is it because they are determined to maintain that Virgilius was a joint-bishop of Marseilles and not a Bishop of Ar'ès, that Peter was a Spanish and not an Italian Bishop, that Germanus was Governor of Constantinople and not Prefect of Rome—in short,—for I might go through all the errors which I have noticed, and many more which I have not—is it that they are desirous to maintain all these things, or is it that, notwithstanding these things, and whether these

* Ib. p. 43.

† Ib. p. 24.

‡ p. 10.

things are true or false, they are prepared to keep up the credit of the book for the sake of its *theology*?

What I have referred to in Mr. Scott's Vindication, coming, as it did, from the gentleman who, you tell us, appeared to be the only person competent to defend Milner, might, I think, by itself, warrant my saying something like what I did; and, after all this discussion, what was it that I really did say? It was simply this;—that if the admirers of Milner were prepared to say that the doctrines which his work inculcated being true, it was of no consequence whether the facts were true or false,—that even if any should go so far as that, I was still prepared to say that, thus looking upon it merely as a work which might be used to inculcate doctrine, it was most feeble, superficial, and defective. This was hypothetically put; and, at all events, I did not charge you with saying anything, of any kind. I am glad that you repudiate any such opinion; but I must say that if you were to confine your disavowal to yourself, and to those whom you know (for I presume you do not know all the admirers of Milner) you would be going quite as far as you have any right to go; and I must further beg to assure you that whatever opinion you may entertain of their competency, there are others who take upon them to speak as decidedly as you do; and there *may* be, among them, some persons who would adopt a line of defence which you would no more think of, than they would think of adopting that very singular one which you have chosen. Whether there really are, or are not, any such persons, it is surely not unfair, and should not be offensive, that I put the extreme case, and offered to meet the question in its broadest form. The allusion to bishops, and their being martyred, was, of course, merely accidental; but it arose from my having in my mind a singular instance of that incorrectness arising from carelessness which we are now considering; and a notice of this case will bring us back to our subject.

In his third volume, p. 243, Milner says;—

“Patto, a Scotch Abbot, was appointed Bishop of Verden, by Charlemagne. The Centuriators only tell us, that he strenuously supported

popish corruptions and human traditions. But Crantzius, from whom they collected this account, would have informed them also of better things. Patto, it appears, had great success among the infidels, but was grieved to see christian professors disgracing the faith by their vices. He faithfully rebuked them; and for his honest zeal in preaching against the sins of nominal christians, was murdered about the year 815." III. 243.

It may be edifying to read the history of a martyred Bishop; but certainly the Golden Legend contains nothing more fabulous than this account of Patto's "great success among the infidels," for he had so little success among them, that his appointment to the Bishopric was little more than nominal; * though, as to their murdering him, I believe there is no record of any such thing, and no ground for supposing that he was murdered at all.

His successor Tanco (or as Milner calls him Tanes) is, indeed, said to have suffered martyrdom for his boldness in rebuking vice; but Milner, by confounding him with Patto, has robbed him of that honour. The next paragraph to that just quoted is as follows;—

"Tanes, who had succeeded Patto in the Scotch Abbey, after a time left his situation, and followed his countryman into Germany, not so much with a desire of martyrdom, say the Centuriators, as of obtaining a richer benefice. Uncharitable surmise! There is too much of this leaven to be found in a work, which, in other respects, abounds in piety and industry. The same Crantzius informs us, that Tanes, in fact, laboured in conjunction with Patto, and, after a while, was appointed his successor to the See of Verden. Were the sufferings and hardships which Patto and himself had sustained among barbarians, likely to render the Bishopric of Verden an enviable object of ambition?" *Ibid.*

Now, Sir, I do not say that I have ever heard or read any such words as the following; but I am apt to think that there may be persons who would be likely to say;—"Well, but "what does it matter whether it was Patto or Tanco who was

* The Chronicle of the Bishops of Verden says, "Hic quasi solo nomine tenuit cathedram Verdensem, sicut et plures successores sui, qui expulsi de sedibus suis a paganis, dyabolo suadente; fideles qui verbum Dei receperant, hinc inde, quo latere potuerunt, sunt dispersi." *Chronicon Epp. Verdens. ap. Leib. Scrip. Bruns. II. 211.*

“martyred? In either case we see the enmity of man to the Gospel, and the zeal and fidelity of the christian martyr. Do you think that Mr. Hey of Leeds, or Mr. Henry Thornton, would have been at all more edified by reading of the martyrdom of Tanco, which did happen, than of Patto, which did not? Are not these things of minor importance, which do not at all affect the “value” of Milner’s History? As to the fact I know nothing about it—you say it is one way, and Milner another; and, I confess, I do not much care which is right, and which is wrong—but as to the ‘practical effect’ of the book—‘does it not’ as Mr. Scott says, ‘in the main inculcate sound doctrine, and insist on holiness of life does it not tend to awaken and arouse; to excite to penitence, and faith, and holy obedience’*—in short is not the historical truth of the matter of at least secondary, if of any importance; and is it not better to let falsehood which men may believe without perishing, remain unnoticed, than to run the risk of lowering the fame and popularity, and perhaps diminishing the usefulness, of a book and a party which have done, and are doing, so much good?”

Understand me clearly, Sir, that I do not charge you with saying this; and therefore I now say with no more personal reference to you, than I had when I made the remark which you quote, in total ignorance of your existence, that those who thus argue, on principles of mere expediency, and an utilitarian view of practical effects, appear to me to be unprincipled persons, who would have been very likely to join in the pious frauds of the Romish Church, and to have admired the Golden Legend, if they had been Papists—that I see no great difference, as to principle, or want of principle, between saying, “It will do good—therefore let us say it, though we know it to be false”—and, “It does good—we know not whether it is true or false—we will not enquire, but will abuse, and try to run down, everybody that does”—that if a man chuses to write a book of dogmatic theology, or practical exhortation, in the form of a novel,

* p. 45. 46.

or romance, or history of fictitious persons, I do not quarrel with him, if his work is true in nature and sentiment; but if he professes to write history, I think it should be true in fact; and if it is not so—whatever apparent, or even real, good it may produce, under the controlling providence of God—it is pernicious. It is a thing which should be exposed; for, by however good a man, and with however good a design, it may have been written, it is treason against truth and the God of truth, even though, to a shortsighted expediency, it may seem to abound to his glory, and to promise excellent “practical effects.”

As to the matter however immediately before us—I refer to it here merely as an instance of incorrect copying; and it will be obvious that Milner was indebted to Alban Butler for these two accounts of Patto and Tanco. Indeed, on the sentence “Crantzius from whom they collected this account would have informed them also of better things;” he gives a reference “See A. Butler, Vol. II.,” and has made out the account of both the Bishops from the following passage of Butler’s work:—

“*ST. TANGO, or TATTA, B.M. Patton, Abbot of Amabaric in Scotland, passing into Germany to preach the Gospel, and being chosen Bishop of Verden, Tanco, who had served God many years in that Abbey in great reputation for his singular learning and piety, was raised to the dignity of Abbot. Out of an ardent thirst after martyrdom, he resigned this charge, and followed his countryman and predecessor into Germany, where after some time he succeeded him in the See of Verden, of which he was the third bishop. His success in propagating the faith was exceeding great, but it was to him a subject of inexpressible grief, to see many, who professed themselves christians, live enslaved to shameful passions. In order to convert, or at least to confound them, he preached a most zealous sermon against the vices which reigned amongst them; at which a barbarous mob was so enraged as fiercely to assault him; and one of them stabbing him with a lance, procured him the glorious crown of martyrdom about the year 815. This account of him is given us by Krantzius. (l. 1. Metrop. c. 22. & 29.) Lesley, l. 5. hist. Wion, l. 3. Ligni vite.” Butler’s *Lives*, Feb. xvi. Vol. II. p. 168.*

You may tell me that these mistakes and incorrect extracts and translations are “minor faults,

quas aut incuria fudit
aut humana parum cavit natura.—HOR.”*

* p. 2.

And they may seem to you very trifling. I cannot say that I view them quite in that light; but certainly I should never think of censuring a work for a *few* things of the kind, or of doubting the learning, or talent, of the author on any such ground; but I beg you to remember—first, that I mention this species of incorrectness only as one of many things which I consider as detracting from the value of Milner's History; and secondly, that I believe such incorrectness to be so frequent, as that I should never feel sure, on Milner's authority, that what I was reading was true. This frequency could, of course, be fully shewn in no other way than by collecting *all* the instances; which would take more time, and trouble, than enough. Nor do I pretend to say that I have ever looked at some parts of the History, or enquired whether they were correct or not; but I know that I have so commonly found what I have investigated to be incorrect, that I cannot feel any confidence in the work; and I consider myself very fairly entitled to presume that what I have not examined, is no more accurate than the other part. I have given many instances, and I will on this occasion mention only two others.

If you turn to the first volume of the original edition of Milner's History, p. 266. you will find that he says, "There is "a remarkable story of one Peregrinus, which *we meet with in* "the works of Lucian, which, as it falls in with this century, "and throws light on the character of Christians who then "lived, deserves to be here introduced." This remarkable story is then given between marks of quotation; and, beginning about the middle of p. 266, occupies the remainder of that page, and the whole of the two next. It stands, with no reference to any other writer, as a translation from Lucian; and one is surprised to find that (except as to the omission of a single sentence, and one or two unimportant—indeed, in almost every case, I should think, unintentional—verbal alterations) it is a straightforward transcript from Bullet's History of the Establishment of Christianity; or rather, from Salisbury's translation of that work, p. 35—41. There is, however, as I have said, no reference to

that or any other modern work, for this quotation, in the original edition ; but in that published by the Dean, there is a reference, "Lardner's Collect. Vol. ii. c. 19.—Bullet's Establishment of Christianity;" which, in the first edition, stood as the reference on, "vulcano at Mount Ætna," on the next page. In either place, the reference is incorrect ; for the quotation from Lucian is not taken from Lardner, and of Empedocles and the "Vulcano at Mount Ætna," (mentioned at p. 359 of Lardner's work) Bullet does not, I believe, say a word ; though this slovenly way of referring to a book, without specifying the page, makes it very difficult to speak with certainty. I apprehend that the references should be divided ; and that the Dean by moving them in their joint form, and by a good many petty verbal alterations in the translation, has not much mended matters. I dare say, however, that he supposed it to be an original translation by his brother ; whose works, he pledged himself, were "most perfectly free from plagiarism;" and, at any rate, I am convinced that he did not know one thing, which is in fact my reason for noticing the matter here—that is, under the head of incorrect copying. The fact is, in carelessly transcribing, a paragraph of Bullet's own writing (or perhaps, I should say of Salisbury's translation of Bullet) is mixed in, and forms a part of the professed extract from Lucian. The sentence beginning "Peregrinus returned" (1st. ed. p. 268, or in the Dean's p. 245) forms a separate paragraph in Bullet's work, the marks of quotation having ceased at the end of the preceding one, and being placed at the beginning of that which follows.

Take another instance—Milner says ;—

"Anselm of Havelburg was a bishop of some literary reputation, and flourished in the middle of this century. The only thing, which I find remarkable concerning him, and it gives a strong presumption in favour of his piety or understanding, or both, is this, that he saw and censured the pharisaism of the monkish institutions. He declared, that there were many in his time, successively rising up, who disapproved of the vanity and novelty of monastic orders." III. p. 434.

I might quote this as an instance of Milner's allowing himself to be misled by the prejudices, or mistakes, of those from

whom he copied; for he here refers us to "Cent. Magd. Cent. XII. 761." and it seems pretty clear that he knew nothing of Anselm but what the Centuriators told him. On their authority he tells us that Anselm "saw and censured the pharisaism of the monastic institutions;" which is a modified, and scarcely fair, translation of the Centuriators,' "hypocrisin monasticam aliquomodo vidit et carpsit." If Milner had known the writings of Anselm, he would have seen the impudent folly of the Centuriators, in setting him forth as a declaimer against monkish hypocrisy; and if he had known the Centuriators, he would not have believed on their testimony, that a discourse against hypocrisy must be levelled against either the Pope, or the monks. But this is not the point for which I cite the passage—"He declared "that there were many in his time, successively rising up, who "disapproved of the vanity and novelty of monastic orders." It must, I think, have surprised some readers to find that there were persons successively rising up in the twelfth century, who disapproved of the *novelty* of "monastic orders;" which one might have supposed had existed long enough to be free from any such charge, whatever might be said of their *vanity*.

But for this the Centuriators are not to blame. What they say on this point is the truth; though, from not being the whole truth, it is calculated to produce the effect of falsehood. Milner would have conveyed their meaning better if he had said "He declared that there were many in his time who disapproved of the *variety* and novelty of the monastic orders successively rising up"—"testatur suo seculo non paucos fuisse qui varietatem et novitatem sectarum monasticarum subinde in Ecclesia exurgentium improbarint." This obviously gives a different idea from that which Milner's words convey; but even this, though true in words, is in fact a falsehood. It is true that Anselm testifies the existence of persons who disapproved of the variety and novelty of orders which arose from time to time—he says there were idle persons who went about, raising questions which puzzled the simple, and who complained that, instead of sticking to the monastic rules of Benedict and Augustine, men had, from

time to time, set up new orders, so as to give a false and mischievous appearance of variableness and mutability to the Christian Church; and who took occasion, from cases of individual apostacy, to throw blame on all these more recent orders. Even those persons against whom Anselm wrote, were far enough from censuring monkish institutions; and *his* particular object was to *defend* even the "variety and novelty" of which they complained, by arguing that it was one of the means employed by God to produce in the Church, from time to time, what would in modern phraseology be called, a revival; and that a variation of outward forms (the dress of the king's daughter) did not prevent her from being all glorious within, through unchangeable faith, hope, and charity. If these instances are insufficient to prove that for which they are adduced, I have more ready, which I omit merely for the sake of brevity; and, I should proceed to the next point immediately, but that this seems to be the most proper place for a few remarks on the subject of references.

It may perhaps seem an inferior matter, but it does appear to me to detract from the value of an ecclesiastical history—or a history of any kind—that its references should be vague and incorrect. You will accuse me of something like "banter," if I do in "sober censure" protest against "Porphyrog" (not merely as being altogether a mistake of the author from whom Milner supposed the person whom he copied to quote) but as being, like "Neubrig.," or "Brompt. Collect." (if the latter had any meaning) too vague, and unsatisfactory. What is one to make too, of "Anth. de Sent.—See Fleury, L. iv. Book 7," which I find in the edition corrected by the Dean, and in the Edinburgh edition of 1834—the only two, beside the first, to which I have, at present opportunity to refer. To be sure if I go to the original edition (which few persons comparatively can do) I find "Athan." instead of "Anth.;" but still the strange reference "Fleury, L. iv. Book 7." remains; and I dare say that, without some friendly suggestion, the reader would be some time before he would guess it to be meant for a reference to the fifty-fourth (LIV.) chapter of the seventh book of Fleury. It is

certainly very odd; but it is scarcely more strange than that "Fleury, c. xii. 26." and "Fleury, B. xxvi. 13." should stand on the *same page* (II. 486.) as references to two *consecutive chapters* of Fleury's History. I have given many instances of the kind in my second letter to Mr. Rose; among them one in which Milner mistook Fleury's small capitals 11 for arabic numerals and quoted the non-existent *eleventh* book of Theodoret.* The same thing occurs again at Vol. II. p. 514. where the *eleventh* book of Gregory of Tours is quoted instead of the second. Moreover, it appears to me, it would be no disgrace to the students of Durham, if they were not in a condition to profit by such a reference as "Ep. 7. Felix." Perhaps from Milner's affectation in calling him "Felix the Bishop" it might not immediately strike them that this was a letter written by the Pope; and if it did, they might not know (at least I do not) that his letters have ever been published in any separate work. Nor

* See p. 19. and the note at p. 55. and also p. 46. where I supposed the same mistake to have happened; but, on looking at the first edition, I find that the reference is there correctly given. Indeed, though I have not had leisure to collate much since you informed me of the variations between the first edition, and that which was corrected by the Dean, I have seen enough to shew me that the former was in some cases right, where the latter is wrong. Two instances just occur to me. In a letter of Gregory (Vol. III. p. 41.) the Dean's edition makes him say, "How I am overloaded no words can express; you may form some idea of the brevity of my letter, in which I say so little of him whom I love above all." Most readers would receive a very different idea from this, if it were printed as it ought to be, and as it stands in the first edition "so little *to* him whom I love above all." Again, in the account of the Waldenses, in Vol. III. p. 456. of the Dean's edition, it is stated that "they were distinct from others in this, that they could not bear the sound of blasphemy, or the naming of the devil, or any others, except on solemn occasions." When a learned friend wrote to me pointing out this, and asking what I thought it could mean, and who the "others" were, I was really puzzled, and was a good while before I guessed that it should be "oaths." Of the perpetuation of mistakes in one edition after another, I have given sufficient proof. Having here referred to the remark on Ambrose in my second letter, p. 46. let me notice a mistake there—at line 8. (not generally) for *Fleury*, read *Milner*.

would they perhaps have been much helped if Milner, instead of dropping—I believe I do no injustice in saying it, and you will recollect another case beside that of Justinian—that part of a reference which he did not understand, had given the whole of Fleury's reference, "Epist. 7. Felic. p. 1075." for they might not have known (as I really believe Milner did not) the book which was referred to. Perhaps they would not have known that they were to look in Labbe's Councils. The period (if they knew the history) would tell them which of the Popes bearing the name of Felix they were to look for, and would guide them to the volume, but would it not have been better to tell them at once? It may be said that it matters not whether the reference is intelligible or not, that Milner's authority is sufficient, and that Mr. Hey of Leeds and Mr. Thornton did not think of turning out the references; but I must express my hope, that the students at Durham, and every where else, who may read Milner's Church History, or any other, will consider the references—not merely as vouchers for the truth of the facts in the text, and turn them out to see whether they are good and sufficient—but as indications of sources from which they may obtain fuller information as to matters which are briefly stated in the history. To proceed, however, to the next point—

2. That Milner garbled—As the word is frequently used, in an improper and invidious sense, for the dishonest practice of picking out words and sentences from their context, in such a way as to make them support some particular opinion, I beg to say that I do not use it in that sense. There may be garbling which is not dishonest, though it may materially detract from the value of a work; but, nevertheless, from the improper use of the word, it is so liable to be misunderstood, that I would not use it if I could think of any other by which to describe Milner's mode of dealing with the historians from whom he transcribed. It is perhaps something like what you call "compressing;" but it is not, properly speaking, compression or abridgement of any kind. It is the picking out parts of facts, and sentences or half sentences of speeches, letters or other documents, in a

way which, to my own mind, destroys the interest of history ; and gives a very imperfect, even when it does not give a false, view of it. If you have Fleury at hand, and will compare his *eighty-nine* lines of the letter of Hosius, with Milner's *twenty two*, you will understand what I mean ;* or to save you that trouble, and for the sake of those who may not have access to Fleury's history, I will here transcribe part of Fleury's account of the Vandalic persecution ; from which, as I have already said, Milner's was evidently obtained—

“Après avoir envoyé cet édit, Huneric commanda de chasser hors de Carthage tous les évêques qui y étoient assemblez, sans leur laisser ni cheval, ni esclave, ni habit à changer ; mais les dépouillant de tout, après leur avoir pris ce qu'ils avoient chez eux. Il y avoit même défense de les loger ni leur fournir des vivres : sous peine aux contrevenans d'être brûlez avec toute leur maison. Les évêques ainsi chassés, résolurent de ne point s'éloigner, de peur qu'on ne dît qu'ils avoient fui la conference : aussi-bien n'avoient-ils plus ni églises ni maisons. Comme ils étoient ainsi gemissans, et exposez à l'air autour des murailles de la ville : le roi sortit par hazard, et ils vinrent tous à lui, en disant : Quel mal avons-nous fait pour être traités ainsi ? Si nous sommes assemblez pour une conference, pourquoi nous dépouiller, nous chasser, nous faire mourir de faim et de froid ? Le roi les regardant de travers, avant que d'avoir ouï leur remontrance, fit courir sur eux des cavaliers, qui en blessèrent plusieurs, principalement des plus vieux et des plus foibles.

“On leur donna ordre de se trouver en un lieu nommé le temple de Memoire. Là on leur montra un papier roulé, et on leur dit : Le roi, quoi qu'irrité de votre désobéissance, veut toutefois vous bien traiter. Si vous jurez de faire ce qui est contenu dans ce papier, il vous renverra à vos églises, et à vos maisons. Tous les évêques répondirent : Nous disons, et nous dirons toujours, que nous sommes chrétiens et évêques. Nous tenons la foi apostolique seule et véritable ; et comme on les pressoit de faire ce serment, Hortulan et Florentien dirent au nom de tous : Sommes-nous des bêtes, pour jurer au hazard, sans savoir ce qui contient ce papier ? Les emissaires du roi leur dirent : Jurez qu'après la mort du roi vous desirez que son fils Hilderic lui succède, ou qu'aucun de vous n'envoyera des lettres outre-mer. Si vous prêtez ce serment, il vous rendra à vos églises. Plusieurs crurent par simplicité qu'ils pouvoient faire ce serment : de peur que le peuple ne leur reprochât qu'il n'avoit tenu qu'à eux qu'on ne rendit les églises. Les autres connoissant la fraude, ne voulurent point jurer : et dirent, qu'il

* See Second Letter to Mr. Rose, p. 19. and Milner II. 87. Fleury L. XIII. c. xxii. Vol. III. 444.

est défendu dans l'évangile, par ces paroles de N.S. Vous ne jurerez point du tout. Alors les officiers du roi dirent : Que ceux qui veulent jurer se retirent d'un côté ; et comme ils se separerent, les notaires écrivoient ce que chacun disoit, et de quelle ville il étoit ; tout de même de ceux qui ne vouloient point jurer, et aussi-tôt les uns et les autres furent mis en prison. Puis les Vandales dirent à ceux qui offrirent de jurer : Parceque vous avez voulu jurer, contre le precepte de l'évangile, le roi ordonne que vous ne voyiez jamais vos villes ni vos églises ; mais vous serez releguez, et on vous donnera des terres à cultiver comme serfs. A la charge toutefois, que vous ne chanterez, ni ne prierez, ni ne porterez point à la main de livre pour lire ; que vous n'administrerez ni les ordres, ni le baptême, ni la penitence. On dit aussi à ceux qui refusoient de jurer : Vous n'avez pas voulu jurer, parceque vous ne souhaitez pas le regne du fils de nôtre roi. C'est pourquoi vous serez releguez dans l'île de Corse, et occupez a couper du bois, pour la construction de vaisseaux." *Fleury*, L. XXX. c. vii. *Tom.* VII. p. 15.

From this Milner gives the following account ;

"Such were the measures made use of to obliterate the doctrines of divine grace in Africa, where they had been so gloriously revived by Augustine. Huneric ordered the Bishops to be expelled from Carthage, stripped them of horses and changes of raiment, and forbad, under terrible penalties, any one to give them victuals or lodgings. The bishops remained without the walls of the city, exposed to the weather ; and meeting accidentally with the king, they all came to him : 'Why, say they, are we treated thus?' He looked with fury, and ordered some armed horsemen to ride in among them, who wounded many.

"Huneric could not but be conscious that his conduct was no less absurd than iniquitous. On second thoughts, he ordered them to go to a place called the Temple of Memory, where they were shewn a paper rolled up, and were required to swear to what was contained in it. Are we like beasts, void of sense and understanding, cried two of them, that we should swear at a venture, without knowing what is contained in the paper? In the issue, of four hundred and forty-six Bishops, who came to the conference, forty-eight died, many of them, probably, through hard usage; forty-six were banished into Corsica, three hundred and two into other places; and most of the rest made their escape." II. 503.

In this case (a specimen of many which it would be tedious to detail) the story appears to me to be so garbled and slurred over, as to lose its interest, and to be inefficient for the purposes for which history is written. I am tempted to continue the quotation two sentences farther ; though what I thus add, illustrates not this point, but one already considered — " Among

“those sent into exile was Vigilus of Thapsus, a man famous for his writings. *To prevent the persecution from being more fierce, he composed a number of treatises under the names of some of the most renowned fathers, as he himself acknowledged with regard to several of them.*” The connexion is as immediate in Fleury as in Milner; but the former says “Entre les évêques, qui furent bannis dans cette persecution, le dernier de la province Byzacene est Vigile de Tapse, celebre pour ses écrits. *La crainte d’aigrir la persecution, lui fit cacher son nom, et il emprunta ceux des peres les plus illustres pour donner plus de cours à ses ouvrages*” &c.

A very striking instance is afforded also by the letter of Pope Gregory of which Milner speaks, in his third volume, at p. 159. To say nothing of the question as to when, or by whom, the letter was written, it would take too much space fully to exhibit that garbling, or cutting down, and picking out, of which I complain; because I must not only reprint about half a page of Milner (which his readers might naturally suppose to be the whole letter) but the letter itself; which is, if I am not mistaken, equal to between ten and eleven of Milner’s pages. This I am unwilling to do; because, though it seems to me a very clear illustration—and moreover, a case in which an erroneous impression is conveyed—yet I am inclined rather to give a part of the room which it would occupy to another case which I cannot help noticing.

You tell me that Joseph Milner’s object was “to place within the reach of the *unlearned* reader those pious deeds and sentiments which had generally received no attention from the writers of ecclesiastical history.” The Dean, however, seems to think that, in some cases at least, his brother had overshoot this mark, and would quite astonish the learned. In his preface to the fourth volume (or, as it is called in the first edition, the first part of the fourth volume) he says;—

“The Editor has no doubt but the subject matter of this volume will afford abundant satisfaction to the Christian reader. Almost every page is replete both with instruction and entertainment; and what

certainly distinguishes this history through a very large portion of it,—that portion, which peculiarly entitles it to the name of the History of the Church of Christ,—is of such a nature as not to have found its way into our *ordinary* ecclesiastical histories. The *learned* reader, when he has perused this book, can scarcely fail to exclaim, How little notice, in general, has been taken of the genuine religious principles and practice of the Bishops Grosseteste and Bradwardine !” [This is the beginning of the preface, in the edition of 1816 ; but it will be found, with one or two unimportant verbal differences, in the preface to the original edition of the fourth (or first part of the fourth volume) p. v.”]

Such a statement as this might naturally lead a reader to look for the fruits of original research ; and he might be surprised, on looking forward to the seventh chapter on Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, to find such a note as this affixed to the first line of it—“ I am obliged principally to Mr. Pegge’s late valuable publication of the life of this distinguished prelate for the following account ; but I have also consulted Fox the martyrologist and other authors.” Thus it stood in the original edition ; but in that of 1816 the Dean has inserted “ Fascic. rer. exp.” after the word “ martyrologist.” Looking forward, however, to p. 53. of the first edition, or p. 50. of the more modern one, we are told that “ Grosseteste resolute in his disobedience” [to the Pope] “ wrote an EPISTLE* on this occasion which has made his name immortal.” We may wish that such a letter, if not intolerably prolix, should be inserted ; but, at any rate, we easily believe that “ some extracts of the epistle may deserve the reader’s attention.” A note on these words in the original edition directs us to “ See Fox, Vol. I. p. 365. and M. Paris, p. 870.” and the Dean has here also added, “ Fascic. rer. Vol. II. 400.” and the extracts immediately follow ;—

“ I am not disobedient to the apostolical precepts.—I am bound by the divine command to obey them. Our Saviour Christ saith, whosoever is not with me, is against me.—Our Lord the Pope appears to be his type and representative. It is impossible then that the sanctity of the Apostolical See can be repugnant to the authority of Jesus Christ. The NON OBSTANTE clause overflows with uncertainty, fraud

* It is thus distinguished by Capitals in both editions.

and deceit, and strikes at the root of all confidence between man and man. Next to the sin of Antichrist, which shall be in the latter time, nothing can be more contrary to the doctrine of Christ, than to destroy men's souls, by defrauding them of the benefit of the pastoral office. Those, who serve their own carnal desires by means of the milk and pool, [so in both editions, and in that of Edin. 1834.] of the sheep of Christ, and do not minister the pastoral office to the salvation of the flock, are guilty of destroying souls. Two enormous evils are in this way committed. In one respect they sin directly against God Himself, who is essentially good; in another against the image of God in man, which, by the reception of grace, is partaker of the divine nature.—For the Holy Apostolical See to be accessory to so great wickedness, would be a horrible abuse of the fulness of power, an entire separation from the glorious Kingdom of Christ, and a proximity to the two princes of darkness. [a note, in both editions, on these words says, 'He seems to mean the Devil and Antichrist.'] No man, faithful to the said See, can, with an unspotted conscience, obey such mandates, even if they were seconded by the high order of angels themselves; on the contrary, every faithful christian ought to oppose them with all his might. It is therefore in perfect consistence with my duty of obedience, that I withstand these enormities, so abominable to the Lord Jesus Christ, so repugnant to the holiness of the Apostolical See, and so contrary to the unity of the Catholic faith. I say then, this See cannot act but to edification; but your PROVISIONS are to destruction. The Holy See neither can nor ought to attempt any such thing; for flesh and blood, and not the Heavenly Father, hath revealed such doctrines."

Had I quoted this under another head, I might have observed, that, although three authorities are given (two for the original, and one for a translation,) yet there seems to be some ground to doubt whether Milner ever looked at either of them—or at least at either of the originals. "He *seems*" says Milner "to mean the Devil and Antichrist"—yes, surely; if Milner had looked at either of these copies of the original, he would have seen that the Bishop said, in this place "*duobus prædictis tenebrarum principibus*" having just ten lines before mentioned Lucifer and Antichrist. In Matthew Paris, the names are particularly conspicuous; being in Roman type, amidst a page of Italic; and though not so peculiarly prominent in the Fasciculus, they are distinguished by capitals, and clear enough. In Fox, too, they are obvious from being the end of a paragraph, however absurd it might be to make them so; but it is

remarkable that he gives no translation of "prædictis."* But against the very words on which Milner puts his note, Fox actually says in his margin, "Two principal princes of darkness, Lucifer and Antichrist." I can suppose that Milner may have looked in Fox's Martyrology, and that this marginal note may have caught his eye (for it will be observed that his extract does not contain the original notice of Lucifer and Antichrist) though really one can hardly conceive that, if that was the case, he would not have looked to see on what ground Fox had made his note.

This is not, however, to our present purpose ; for I now cite it only as an instance of that species of garbling by which the very nature and characteristics of documents are, in a great degree, lost ; and a very imperfect or false impression of facts or opinions is conveyed. It seems to me that it would have been right to give at length a document on which Milner laid so much stress, especially as it is not very long ; or that if he thought abridgement or compression necessary, it should have been done with great care and accuracy. I here give the whole as it is translated (not always quite correctly) by Fox, because Milner refers to him ; and mark by *italics* those parts which he, or some one else, seems to have selected, and formed into what he gives as extracts ;—

"Salutem, Pleaseth it your wisdom to understand that *I am not disobedient to any the Apostolic precepts*, but both devoutly and reverently with the natural affection of a son obey the same, and also am an utter enemy to all those that resist such apostolic precepts as a child zealous of his Father's honour. And truly, *I am no less than bound thereunto by the precept and commandment of God*. For the apostolic precepts are none other, nor can be, than consonant and uniform to the doctrine of the apostles, and of our Saviour Christ being the Master and Lord of all the Apostles : *whose type and person*, specially in the consonant and uniform hierarchy of the church, *the Lord Pope seemeth to bear the same*, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ saying, *Whosoever is not with me*, the same is against me. Therefore, against him neither is nor can be the most divine sanctity of the See Apostolical. The tenor then of your

* I suppose he must have had some other reading, which he translates "most principal."

foresaid apostolical letter is not consonant to true sanctity, but utterly dissonant and disagreeing to the same. First; for that *the clause of this your letter and many such other letters like, which clauses always ye so much do urge (non obstante) induced and brought in upon no necessity of any natural law to be observed, doth swarm and flow with all inconstancy, boldness, pertinacy, impudency, lying, and deceiving, and is also a sea of mistrust in giving credit to no man.* Which as it swarmeth with these, so in like manner with innumerable other vices which hang and depend upon the same; moving and disturbing the purity of christian religion and life agreeable to the same, as also the public tranquillity of men. Moreover, *next after the sin of Lucifer, (which shall be in the later time to wit, of Antichrist, the child of perdition, whom the Lord shall destroy with the breath of his mouth) there is not nor can be any kind of sin so repugnant and contrary to the doctrine of the Apostles and Holy Scripture, and to our Saviour Christ himself more hateful, detestable, and abominable, than to destroy and kill men's souls, by defrauding them of the mystery of the pastoral office, which, by the ministry of the pastoral cure, ought to save and quicken the same.* Which sin by most evident places of the Scripture, such men are discerned and known to commit, which being in the authority of the pastoral dignity, *do serve their own carnal desires and necessities with the benefit of the milk and wool of the sheep and flock of Christ, and do not minister the same pastoral office and charge to the benefit and salvation of those their sheep.* The same therefore by the testimony of the Scripture is not the administration of the pastoral ministry, but the killing and destruction of the sheep. And that *these two kind of vices be most vile and wicked (although after a differing sort) and far exceeding all other kind of wickedness hereby it is manifest: for that the same are directly contrary to two virtues most chiefly good (although differing in themselves) and unlike together.* For that is called most wicked, which is contrary to a thing most good. So much then as lieth in the offenders, the *one of their offences is directly against the Deity, which of Himself is always essentially and supernaturally good; the other is against the deification and the image of God in man, which is not always, but by the participation of God's lightsome grace, essentially and naturally good.* And forsomuch as in things being good, the cause of good is better than the effect; and like as again in evil things, the cause of evil is worse than the effect of evil proceeding thereof: hereby it is manifest, that the inducers of such wicked destroyers of God's image and deification in the sheep of Christ (that is, the church of God) are worse than those chief destroyers, to wit, Lucifer and Antichrist

“And as in these degrees of wickedness how much more excellent such be, who having a great charge committed to them of God (to edification and not to destruction) the more are they bound to keep away and exclude such wicked destroyers from the church of God: *so much is it also*

*off, that this Holy Seat Apostolical, to whom the Lord Jesus Christ hath given all manner of power (to edification, as the Apostle saith, and not to destruction) can command, or will go about any such thing, urging unto so great wickedness, so odious, detestable, and abominable to our Lord Jesus Christ, and also so pernicious to mankind. For this should be a great defection, corruption, and abuse of the said seat and fulness of power, and an utter separation from the glorious throne of our Lord Jesus Christ, and a near neighbourhood unto the two most principal princes of darkness, sitting in the chair of pestilence, prepared to the pains of hell. Neither can any man, which is subject and faithful to the said see, (and not cut away from the body of Christ, and from the said holy Sec) with sincere and unspotted conscience obey such manner of precepts and commandments, or whatsoever other attempts proceeding, yea, though from the high order of angels themselves, but rather ought of necessity with all their strength to withstand and rebel against the same. Wherefore my Reverend Lord, I, like an obedient child, upon my bound duty of obedience and fidelity which I owe to both the parents of this holy apostolic see, and partly for love of unity in the Body of Christ joined with the said See, do not obey, but withstand and utterly rebel against these things in the said letter contained, and especially which urge and tend to the foresaid wickedness, so abominable to the Lord Jesus Christ, so repugnant to the holiness of the holy apostolic See, and so contrary to the unity of the Catholic faith. Neither for this cause can your discretion determine any extremity to me, because all my doing and gainsaying in this matter is no resistance nor rebellion, but a childly obedience to the divine precept, and honour due both to father and mother. Briefly therefore repeating my words, I say, that this holy Apostolic See cannot do anything but to edification, and nothing at all to destruction: for this is the fulness of power, to be able to do all things to edification. But these which you call provisions be not to edification but to manifest destruction. The Holy Apostolic See therefore neither can nor ought to attempt any such thing; because that flesh and blood, which cannot enter into the Kingdom of God, hath revealed the same, and not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ which is in heaven.”**

* We may observe that there are, in Milner, three marks of omission. How far those little lines, which are so frequently used for other purposes, are sufficient for this, may be doubted; but if I were to say that there were no marks of omission there, I have no doubt that these would be pointed out to me. I quite grant that they are better than nothing if consistently used; but surely they should have been put wherever there is an omission, for the natural supposition must be, that the matter between them is ungarbled, and one continuous passage in the original. I suspect that this practice may have misled some who have vouched for Milner, and so may

I may be told that Milner's extracts contain "the substance," or "the spirit," or what not, of the Bishop's letter. I should deny the fact; but, without disputing about it, I must say that I think such translations are of no value; and that, supposing them to contain some good theological sentiments, any man of common ability and piety would be better employed in putting those sentiments together, in the poorest and most commonplace way, as his own, than in thus garbling the language of others. But to proceed to what is more important.

3. Milner intentionally altered passages which he quoted. This has been, in a great degree, anticipated by what I have already said; for it would not have been easy to give specimens of garbling, which did not include intentional alteration of passages quoted. So much has been said, even in this pamphlet, of the extracts from Allix, respecting Evervinus and Reinerius Saccho, that it is perhaps unnecessary to dwell on the point, or repeat my idea that when a writer gives words in marks of quotation, they ought to be the very words of the author quoted; unless they profess to be a translation, and then they ought to be a full and strict translation. Indeed, who, that reads some occasional statements of Milner, could doubt that he was of the same opinion, and acted upon it; In giving some extracts from Wickliffe's works, he adds a note by way of caution,—“N. B. “Though several of the quotations which follow are marked “with inverted commas, for the sake of distinction, they are to “be understood as only containing the substance of Wickliffe's “sentiments, and not his words.—The originals are frequently “in latin, and often in such antiquated english as would be “unintelligible to ordinary readers.” IV. 126. Again, with

one or two expressions here and there which would lead one to suppose that he was very scrupulous about the strict accuracy and fidelity of his extracts—for instance, having translated a sentence of St. Augustine by “there is a person, by whom the invisible Majesty is exhibited, the Word,” &c. &c. adds, in a note, “I use the word Person, because I can scarcely otherwise express the author's meaning; but it is fair to tell the reader, that there is nothing for it in the original.” Vol. II. p. 448.

regard to Lord Cobham, "I generally give the very words ;
 " though sometimes, for the sake of brevity, only the substance :
 " and sometimes I put a modern phrase in the place of one now
 " antiquated." Ibid. 179. Again, as to Luther ; "The extracts
 " here given are almost literal translations. But every one, who
 " has been used to the making of extracts, knows, that in many
 " cases where a great deal is omitted for the sake of brevity, it
 " is necessary to add a few words to prevent obscurities. This,
 " however, should always be done with the greatest care, so as
 " not to affect the sense." Ibid. 354. And why not, one might
 ask, with a notice, that they are added words ?—but surely
 those who see such notes as these appended to particular ex-
 tracts, might well suppose that in cases where no such caution
 is given the words "marked with inverted commas," are "the
 very words ;" and, indeed, without this I do not see how we
 can place confidence in a writer.

I would, however, extend this rule farther, so as to get rid
 of what appears to me to be a very mawkish kind of affectation
 —the giving a pretty turn to phrases or conceits, which modern
 fastidiousness may consider as homely or inelegant. I do not
 mean that a man is to transcribe what is coarse or vicious ; or
 to re-write what should not have been written at all. If his
 author has gross ideas, let him keep them ; if he expresses an
 idea which is good, in language which is gross, let it be trans-
 lated into decency by him who wishes to transfer the idea ; and
 let him tell us that he is giving us the idea of another, in his
 own words. But it is not of this, or of anything like it, that I
 speak ; and a single instance will explain my meaning better
 than any attempt at description. An Archbishop, who had
 been a monk until he was sixty years old, was, his biographer
 and friend tells us, extremely fond, even after his promotion, of
 slipping away from public business, when he could do it with
 a safe conscience, and getting into his monastery with his monks.
 He adds that once, after presiding in chapter, he said to them
 in a playful manner ;—"As an owl, while it is in a cavern with
 its young ones, enjoys itself, and is comfortable in its own way,

but when it gets among crows and ravens and other birds, is hunted and pecked at, and quite miserable, so it is with me : for with you I enjoy myself, and it is the delightful and only solace of my life. But when I am away from you, living among men of the world, the pressure of various business tears me in pieces, and secular affairs, for which I have no taste, distress me." In the first edition of *Milner* I find—" 'While I am with you,' he would often say to his friends, 'I am like a bird in a cave amidst her young, and enjoy the sweets of retirement and social affections. But when I am thrown into the world, I am like the same bird hunted and harassed by ravens or other fowls of prey : the incursions of various cares distract me ; and secular employments, which I love not, vex my soul.'" *Vol. III. p. 340.* I do not admire the taste which discards the owl ; and I seem as if I got a different view of character, when, instead of what his own monk tells us he said on one occasion, after presiding in chapter, I get a smooth speech about a bird and social affections which he was in the habit of saying over to his friends. But even this did not suit the more refined taste of the Dean, who turned the "cave" into a "nest," in his edition. This may be still prettier and more sentimental and perhaps more dignified ; but the spirit and the character appear to me to be gone. I do not pretend to say how far a man may honestly polish what he quotes ; and you will remember I only point out *this* kind of alteration, as the milder form of that evil of which I am now speaking. Still I must say that I would not give anything for translations so made ; and cannot but think, that the world would be better without them.*

* I have frequently felt a difficulty in deciding under what class some cases, which I find it necessary to state, should be placed ; for, as you may have observed, some of them illustrate more than one point. This case of *Anselm*, though adduced for another purpose, is a remarkable instance of *Milner's* following a modern writer, and referring his reader to the original. He tells us to "See his life written by *Eadmer*;" but I do not think he ever saw it himself. I feel no doubt that he did see, and took this story, from a book which he does not once quote or allude to in any one of the twenty pages of this chapter ; though I

The three propositions which I have stated comprise, I think, all the charges which I have brought against Milner's History specifically and in detail; and it appears to me that they are sufficiently proved. At the same time I feel that, from the very nature of the case, the proof must be less strong than it might be made, were it not that to give it fully, would obviously require a work twice as large as Milner's History. Should any part of my proof, however, appear to you insufficient, I trust you will find me able and willing to give more examples, if you will only fairly and fully meet those which I have already given.

That point, however, which I deem most important in attempting to judge of the value of Milner's History, has as yet been

believe that he ought to have referred to it instead, every time that he referred to the works of Anselm, which I do not believe him to have consulted at all. The grounds of presumption on this latter point must occupy a good deal of space; and it will be time enough to give them when you assure me that you have examined the matter, and are deliberately of opinion that Milner did quote directly from Anselm's works. As to the former, I cannot think that he took the story from Eadmer's life of Anselm, where it stands thus;—"Verum salva in omnibus et ad omnes innocentia suæ conscientiæ modicum respirabat ab his, et magnopere consolabatur, si quando se monachorum claustro inferre, et quæ institutio vitæ ipsorum expetebat, coram eis effari valebat. Quod ipse quadam vice Capitulo eorum præsidens, et ex more de hujusmodi liberius agens, dicendi fine completo, jucunda hilaritate alludens, jocosa comparatione innotuit, dicens: Sicut bubo, dum in caverna cum pullis suis est, lætatur, et suo sibi modo bene est; dum vero inter corvos aut corniculas seu alias aves est, incursatur ac dilaniatur, omnino quoque sibi male est: ita et mihi. Quando enim vobiscum sum, bene mihi est et grata ac singularis vitæ meæ consolatio. Quando vero remotus a vobis inter seculares conversor, hinc inde variarum me causarum incursus dilacerant, et quæ non amo sæcularia negotia vexant" Lib. II. p. 22. How came Milner to think of translating, or rather, if he had seen could he have translated—Eadmer's "quadam vice," by "he would *often* say to his friends." Can you suggest any better explanation than that he got the story from the Centuriators (to whom I believe him to have been indebted for all the extracts which are given us from Anselm's works) who introduce the story by saying "De hac aulæ infelicitate sæpe apud suos familiares queri solitus est episcopus 'Sicut bubo' inquiens 'dum in caverna'" &c. *Cent.* XI. p. 336.

scarcely touched on. I did indeed notice it in my first letter to Mr. Rose—or rather I had noticed it in the *Strictures* which I reprinted with that letter; but neither there, nor in my second letter (which related principally to the question of secondary sources) was it so clearly stated as it ought to be, now that we are discussing, not merely the points which were under consideration in these cases, but the general value of Milner's work. In that second letter I said, "I feel that all this is merely preliminary, and that except in that view it would not have been worth while to give even this trouble to these points. A greater, and vastly more important, question remains, on which it would not be worth while to enter in a letter already tedious; but I shall, if it please God, find a better opportunity to discuss it. It is,—Whether Milner gives a true history of the real church—not as to any particular views of doctrine, but as to its extent and circumstances; and whether his history (which I may perhaps be now permitted to characterize as superficial and inaccurate, and for the most part borrowed from the writers whose defects it professes to supply) is not in fact calculated to give a false view of things, and to mislead both christians and infidels, as to the real state of the church of Christ during many ages." p. 86. Equally absurd would it be, to enter on so extensive a subject in a pamphlet like this; but I do hope, as I then stated, to discuss the question, and gradually to bring forward such matter as may render the argument intelligible, and the proof convincing. On the present occasion, therefore, I will merely state distinctly one thing which appears to me to be a great and very mischievous fault in Milner's *History*; and to have a direct, and important, bearing on the question which I have just stated—I mean the promulgation and maintenance of an idea that, for many ages, the church of Christ could scarcely be said to *exist*, and the affectation of searching with a candle to find, if possible, some one or two individuals, who, by the help of our utmost charity and condescension to the times in which they lived, may be set forth as proofs that the promise of God was not entirely and altogether a lie—as proofs, that whatever defec-

tive historians may have said, or not said, and whatever people may suppose, the church of Christ may be truly and fairly said to have *existed*. I might refer you, and every person at all acquainted with Milner's History to the tone and tenor of the whole work, but a few extracts will not only afford proof to those who are not familiar with it, but will farther illustrate my meaning.

"Impressed however with the certain truth of the declaration made by the divine author of Christianity 'that the gates of hell shall never prevail against his church' I have endeavoured all along to discover her *actual existence*." III. Pref. 1.

"A proof may hence be drawn that *some* spirit of genuine religion was *still preserved* in France." Vol III. 95.

"The influences of divine grace seem to have been withheld, in the East, *entirely*. Men had there filled up the measure of their iniquities." III. 129.

"Learning was very low: the taste of the age was barbarous: we have seen however that *Christ had then a church*; and the reader, if he pleases, may travel through still *darker* scenes; yet I trust *some glimmerings* of the presence of Christ will appear." III. 132.

"He might be a pious christian: there is doubtless no proof to the contrary. He not only condemned the worshipping of images, but also rejected relics and the intercession of saints. But there lived *none* at that time capable of doing justice to the holiness of his motives, if indeed, as there is reason to hope, they were holy." III. 157.

"I am anxiously looking for the features of the church of Christ in this very gloomy period, and *seem to think* that her *existence* was most *probably* to be found in the churches lately planted, or, in those which were then in an infant state." III. 167.

"It was evident that the *whole face* of the church was altered: from the year 727, to about the year 2000, we have the dominion of the Beast;" &c. III. 170.

"*Where then was the church* in the eighth century? She *still subsisted*; and the *opposition made to idolatry by Charles and the Council of Frankfort, demonstrates her existence*." III. 171.

"The reader, however, has seen, in this dark century, a *clear demonstration*, that the church of Christ *still existed*. He may now, if he please, descend with me to the ultimate point of Christian depression." III. 244.

"In a *dearth* so excessive, there are *few*, who deserve to be noticed either for knowledge or for piety; and *fewer* still for both." III. 271.

"The very toleration of the Roman popedom itself, after the detection of its flagitiousness before all the world, evinces the uncommonly

low condition of christian knowledge in this age; proof, however, will appear, that the *Spirit of God had not forsaken the church*, and that *there were those who revered and felt the power of her doctrines.*"—*Ibid.*

"That the true doctrines of the Gospel, and *some* true knowledge of their experimental use and power, were not *lost* in the church *altogether*, the following quotations will abundantly evince; though of the authors themselves no particular account can be given, nor is it very clear at what exact period of time some of them lived." III. 273.

This writer [Theophylact] it should be observed, belonged to the eastern church, of which we hear very little in the dark ages before us . . . as it is not to be supposed, that the light was preserved to *no purpose*, we may safely conclude, that the real church was still *in existence* in the East. III. 276.

"*Such was the light*, scattered here and there, in the darkness of the times, by which the God of grace and mercy called, nourished, and sanctified his church, and preserved to himself a godly seed in the earth, who should serve him in the Gospel of his Son, and prevent the cruel tyranny of the Prince of darkness from *completely* overspreading the world." III. 282.

"Thus largely did the 'King of Saints' provide for the instruction of his church, in the darkness of the middle ages. The Waldenses are the middle link, which connects the primitive christians and fathers with the reformed; and, *by their means*, the *proof* is completely established, that salvation, by the grace of Christ, felt in the heart, and expressed in the life, by the power of the Holy Ghost, has ever *existed* from the time of the apostles till this day." III. 511.

"His great work was 'Concerning the Cause of God against Pelagius.' An admirable performance! whether one considers the force of his genius, the solidity of his reasoning powers, or the energy of his devotion. In reviewing it, it gave me great satisfaction to observe, that *the Spirit of God had not forsaken the Church*; but, on the contrary, in one of the *darkest* periods had raised up a defender of divine truth, who might have done honour to the brightest."* IV. 79.

These extracts sufficiently shew the feelings with which Milner wrote. Those feelings he has, I apprehend, imparted to

* Is it not strange that, after apparently resting the proof that "*the Spirit of God had not forsaken the church*," on this work of Bradwardine—after speaking of him and his work as if they afforded the only evidence of that most momentous fact—he should proceed to tell us, on the authority of "Sir Henry Savile, the learned editor of the principal work of Bradwardine," that, "no sooner was this performance given to the public, than it was received with the *greatest applause of all learned doctors*, and found its way into *almost every library* throughout Europe." p. 86.

many who have read his history with confidence ; and to some who recommend that work as if it contained the best, if not the only proof—or something as near to proof as we can get—that the church of Christ has not been at various times since its foundation, completely extinct. Mr. Raikes says—

“The work of Mosheim, if read alone, might seem to impugn the very fact of any other than the nominal existence of Christianity ; and we should doubt whether a spark of real piety remained, [surely not if we believe the promise of God] amidst the accumulations of folly and corruption which he records. That *there was* such a remnant still existing is shewn with *sufficient probability* by Milner ; and though from the very nature of things, truth was likely to be hid out of the sight of any general observer, and to be mixed with much alloy even in the minds where it was retained ; no one can read Milner’s History without secret delight, at observing the succession of men who were raised up from time to time, and by whom the lamp of life was conveyed from one to another through the darkness of the middle ages.”—*Remarks on Clerical Education*. p. 189.

It is then only a *probability*—but a *sufficient* one—though how a mere probability, in such a matter, can be deemed sufficient by Christians, I cannot conceive. I have no wish to press Mr. Raikes’s words, or to construe them as strictly as if they had been deliberately used in scholastic disputation ; but the casual, even inconsiderate, use of such language by such a writer, is perhaps the clearest and most striking proof and illustration of that state of opinion which now exists among christians ; and which has been, I believe, chiefly produced—to say the least, greatly promoted, by Milner’s History.

The Christian Observer speaks as if Milner’s work was the report of a discovery ; and as if, until it was published, people in general supposed (and had no means of knowing better) that at some periods God had left himself without witness.

“We shall heartily rejoice if the present discussion shall revive the public attention to a work, which, controversy apart, we believe to have rendered great service to the cause of Christianity, by shewing, that, mournful as have been the defections and contentions of the professed Church of Christ in every age, *there has yet always been* a body of spiritually minded persons ; that God has *never left himself without witness* ; and that in the darkest times *there have been* knees that have not bowed to the Baal of the age.” *Chr. Observer*. Nov. 1834. p. 668.

We may take another illustration of popular opinion, on this point, from the advertisement prefixed to a volume of the "Christian's Family Library;" entitled, "The History of the church of Christ from the Times of the Apostles to the Rise of the Papal Apostacy. Abridged from the work of the Rev. Joseph Milner. M.A. 1834."

"The present volume furnishes, chiefly in the language of Milner, a view of the history of the church of Christ, from the Apostolic times to the period when the rise of the papal power wrought an *entire change* in the *state and prospects* of Christianity, and quickly drove the faithful servants of Christ "into the wilderness." This change, indeed, was so great and *total*, that it seems most fitting entirely to change the form of the history, and, instead of following, with the author in whose steps we have heretofore trodden, the few remaining disciples of Christ into their exile and obscurity, to commence anew the narrative, under the more comprehensive title of "a HISTORY OF THE PAPACY; and of the sufferings of the church of Christ under its dominion.'"

But, Sir, your own language shews that you take much the same view of things, which is given in these extracts, when you tell us of Milner—and you bring it forward, as if it was a sort of peculiarity, of which I was not aware, and of which it was necessary that people should be apprised before they could fully understand what Milner's undertaking really was—that "he believed that the spirit of piety *breathed* in the most *lifeless* "period, and that the light of grace shone over the darkest "region of the church." p. 78. One would suppose that you were making known some peculiarity of opinion of which people in general would not think of suspecting him—however, I quite agree with you that he believed it, and he told people that he believed it, and he undertook to prove it, and he wrote a book for that purpose. So far I am sure we shall agree; and, if you like to go a step farther, and to say that *he has* proved it, I will not here stop to discuss the point; but, admitting it for the sake of argument, I must add, that he has proved it in such a manner as to convey an impression that the fulfilment of God's promise has only just amounted to an escape from failure; and this, too, when there was abundance of evidence ready to his hand.

I have already stated at p. 26. that I believe Milner, in writing the history of eight hundred years, to have seen no original writers beside *eleven* whom I have there named. The number of writers of whom some account is given by Dupin (from whom Milner professed to "derive particular information on subjects of this nature,"*) is, I think, rather above a thousand. Is it not possible, and even probable, that if Milner had looked into some of these many hundred writers, he might have found what was to his purpose? I do not say that he was to read, or even to look at, or even to look for, all, or half, of them; but it may be doubted whether he saw one in a hundred. This ignorance (you may ascribe it to want of "time and facilities," or to what you please) has rendered his proof, if it can be called a

* Vol. II. p. 528. This statement occurs in a note on the following sentence, "MARK* the hermit lived about the beginning of this century," being referred to by an asterisk placed as it is here. Considering what Milner's design and business was, one is tempted to ask, what he could mean by "subjects of *this nature*." Did he mean that, in general when he appeared to give any "particular information" respecting the works of writers, he copied from Dupin? This would be true as I have already shewn; indeed the same page furnishes an instance of such close and careless copying from Dupin (or rather from the translation—for the original is correct) as makes it appear, that Paulinus became Bishop of Nola, before he was born. In the original edition, and the corrected editions of 1816 and 1824, and in what is I believe the most recent, that of Edinburgh, 1834, we are told that he was "born about the year 453," that he was "ordained bishop in 409," and "peaceably enjoyed his Bishopric till his death in 431." The mistake of 453 for 353 is, as I have said, in the English translation of Dupin; but its perpetuation in Milner's History is the more remarkable, because in the three first mentioned editions (and I suppose in all others, except the Edinburgh, which is a close printed single volume) these three dates, are not only given in the text, but ranged conspicuously in the margin. But is not the *theology* good? Very good—what there is of it—but Mark the Hermit, whose treatises (especially that, "De his qui putant ex operibus se justificari") would have furnished matter more worthy of Milner's attention, than much which he has given, is dispatched in fifteen lines. "I regret," he says, "that I can communicate no more of such a man"—to be sure he could not, while he was content to know just only what his popish oracle was pleased to tell him.

proof, not merely meagre and unsatisfactory, but really conducive to the establishment of an opinion scarcely distinguishable from that which he wrote to disprove. He has given his readers an idea that other ecclesiastical historians (of whom many of them know nothing whatever) have paid no attention to the pious deeds and sentiments of those who constituted the real church of Christ, and have in fact made it appear as if no such church existed; and that he is setting them right; and supplying their defects, and shewing that the church did exist; and, between him and his eulogists, the impression is conveyed that by his "unwearied research" he found all, or nearly all, that was to be found for the purpose of proof. You tell us yourself, that "his success in this department has won for him the affection and gratitude of the church of Christ. And it has ever been rather a subject of SURPRISE that he should have produced "so MUCH, than of complaint that his materials have proved "defective."

Really, Sir, I know of nobody but himself that has ever complained of his materials being defective; and my complaint—as, most people, I hope, understand—is, that while his materials were abundant, his own work is defective. So far, then, we are agreed; but as to the *surprise* excited by his success in finding "so much," it is obvious that anything like surprise must have arisen from ignorance of the defective modern historians; for how much has Milner "produced" from any other source? With respect to many centuries *every* pious deed and sentiment which he has produced, he borrowed from them. When therefore I find you recording, and I presume partaking in, the surprise that Milner should have produced "so much," you must excuse my telling you, as freely as you tell me, that I cannot but think that you have "never fully understood what "Milner's 'undertaking' really was," and that therefore you are "unable to judge what kind or extent of reading the accomplishment of it required." Under these circumstances it seems to me that the best way will be for each of us to say what he thinks about a point on which the controversy appears very con-

siderably to hinge. Suffer me, however, to reverse the order and speak first of the extent, and then of the kind, of reading which should have preceded Milner's attempt.

As to the extent—I presume not to say how much, or how little, reading might excuse an attempt; and I do not, and never did (as you pretend*) “deem indispensable in a writer of history” all that “kind of service,” which I spoke of as necessary before any man could do, to such and so great a subject, even that imperfect justice which may be done by man. Much less and lighter service—and even much less trouble than Milner actually took, would have made his book most interesting and valuable. At the same time, it seems to me quite obvious that in proportion as any man has the facilities and powers which I described, the better chance he will have of finding that which Milner sought. Indeed, unless he has something like those means for performance, it seems to me in some degree arrogant and presumptuous to talk of writing “The History of the real Church,” to call himself “the real church Historian,” and to pretend to offer to the public any general work of the kind. With more limited means and powers, a man may discuss particular subjects, and offer what the Germans call “contributions” to ecclesiastical history with respect to certain periods, or facts, or doctrines, or persons—but to talk of “The History of the Church of Christ” without something like what I stated—that is without leisure for the work, and free access to those large and old libraries in which alone any considerable collection of the necessary books can be looked for—without this, the attempting such a thing as Milner undertook seems to imply, either a vain and deceitful arrogance, with which I have no idea of charging him, or else (what I believe to be the real state of the case) a very great degree of ignorance as to the history of the Church, and as to the sources of information which exist.

For, secondly—as to the *kind* of reading. This is in truth the great point, and the point in which Milner peculiarly failed.

* P. 80.

I do not mean to dispute Dean Milner's voucher for the "immense reading" of his brother; but I must repeat that "his knowledge was not of *that description* which would have qualified him for the task which he undertook; and without which, neither piety nor talents could render him respectable as a writer of church history—especially of *such a history* as he projected."* You tell me that "he wished to place within the reach of the unlearned reader those *pious deeds and sentiments* which had generally received no attention from ecclesiastical writers;" and really the words which I have marked by italics immediately bring to one's mind the very books to which it might have been expected that he would in the first instance apply—they seem almost a translation of *Acta Sanctorum et Bibliotheca Patrum*. These works, consisting together of between eighty and ninety folio volumes, contain an immense quantity of the lives and works of persons more or less eminent in the church in every age; and especially in those ages during which it is difficult to find similar materials elsewhere. I am perfectly aware that, on my making this suggestion, some persons may ask;—

First, do I blame Milner then for not having waded through ninety folio volumes? Certainly not—I would have imposed no such task upon him; but I say, that a writer setting out on such an undertaking as Milner's, should have these books constantly at hand; and I do not hesitate to add, that if Milner had spent as much time on these two books, as he did in reading, translating, and transcribing, Fleury and Dupin and the Centuriators, he might have made a very interesting and useful work.

But Secondly—are not both these popish books, and is not the *Bibliotheca Patrum* full of false doctrine and superstition, and are not the *Acta Sanctorum* stuffed with lying legends of pretended saints? To this I reply, that without all doubt, the *Bibliotheca Patrum* contains a good deal of error, and nonsense, and trash of various kinds; and the *Acta Sanctorum* furnish

* First Letter to Mr. Rose, p. 8, sec. ed.

memoirs of all sorts of saints, good, bad, and indifferent—of all ages and countries—some knaves, some fools, some nonentities—but what is the chaff to the wheat? and wheat there is for him who will winnow it. However, the most important consideration is this—that whether these books are popish or protestant, good or bad, *they are* the sources from whence Milner got most of what he tells us—indeed, during many centuries, every syllable that he tells us—of most of the works and lives of the members of the real church; only, instead of looking for himself, he was satisfied to take things at second hand, and generally from papists. The Bibliotheca Patrum contains most of the works from whence Dupin made the extracts which Milner borrowed from him (at least, from his translator) and many of these works he might have run through, in such a way as to form an opinion whether they belonged to the class of which he was in search, in almost as short a time as he could read and transcribe Dupin's account of them; and most of the biographical sketches which Milner has given, came to him from the Acta Sanctorum, not much improved by being dribbled through the pen of Alban Butler. I repeat, therefore, that, good or bad, these books *are* the sources to which he was really indebted; and that he ought to have had recourse to them. I do not say that he ought to have read them through; but he ought at least to have been able to refer to them, and to look them over, as he did the works of Dupin and Alban Butler.

But where was he to get them? Where, for instance, was he to get the twenty-seven folio volumes of the Bibliotheca Maxima? This is a question which you can perhaps answer more easily than I can; for you profess to have used it in writing your pamphlet. You live where Milner did, and if you could turn to this largest and best edition of the Bibliotheca Patrum for so comparatively trifling a purpose, I do not know that he might not by a little management have procured the use of it, in so great a work as he undertook. I do not know that it is unreasonable to suppose that his facilities might be as great as yours; especially, considering the station which his brother occupied

in the University of Cambridge. I confess however that the best edition to which you refer is a large, scarce, and costly work, and one to which I have never yet been so happy as to have access; but I apprehend that the earlier editions are not very expensive—at least I know that my own copy, a remarkably good one in eight volumes folio bound in three, cost me little more than half as much as my copy of Milner's History, which was not very expensively bound, or I believe quite new, when I bought it. This, however, the first and scantiest edition, contains works by more than two hundred writers, among whom are some belonging to every century from the first to the fifteenth inclusive; and such a work, when swelled by perpetual accessions to more than three times the original number of volumes, did of course form the very book that Milner wanted.* Some-

* I have already said that I possess only the first edition; but, through the kindness of the Dean and Chapter of Gloucester, I have access to that of Paris, 1634, in 17 vols. folio. It contains works by nearly twice as many writers as the other: and, as this letter may come into the hands of those who have not the same acquaintance with the book as you profess, I may be permitted to state one or two particulars respecting it, in order that they may in some degree judge of its fitness and value for Milner's purpose, of the ease with which it might be consulted, and of the probability that its contents would have repaid the labour of consultation. From a hasty enumeration (which if not perfectly correct is quite sufficient for our present purpose) it appears that beside a few anonymous authors, and one of uncertain date, it contains of Century I. 14 writers.—II. 6.—III. 14.—IV. 51.—V. 51.—VI. 39.—VII. 26.—VIII. 14.—IX. 31.—X. 10.—XI. 23.—XII. 42.—XIII. 20.—XIV. 19.—XV. 4.—XVI. 3. Beside a general index, and a table of the passages of Scripture quoted, (neither of them very good) it has an alphabetical and a chronological list of the authors, with some account of them, and reference to their works; and also a table of contents arranged according to subjects, which is as follows, the number in parenthesis signifying the number of works "*PRIMA CLASSIS, complectitur authores, sive opuscula, quæ in Sacram Scripturam aut ejus partem aliquam, expositionem, sive commentarium, continent.* (33.)—*SECUNDA, Homilias, Sermones, sive orationes de rebus divinis continet.* (55.)—*TERTIA, Epistolas de Deo et rebus divinis* (72.)—*QUARTA, tractatus, libros, et opuscula contra varias hæreses, sectas, schismaticos Judæos, et Gentiles.* (82.)—*QUINTA, authores et opuscula quæ conti-*

thing analogous might be said of the Bollandist *Acta Sanctorum*; but I have not, at present, access to it; and indeed this is not the place for the discussion of such matters. The mere mention of these books, to those who have even the slightest knowledge of them, is sufficient.

These seem to me to be the first books, and with them should be joined the Councils. With this apparatus only, a man of common industry who would read carefully, and translate faithfully, might do a great deal towards what Milner proposed; and without them—for it is almost absurd to suppose the possibility of finding an equivalent in any collection of separate lives or memoirs or editions of works, though these, when they exist, or can be obtained, are of course to be preferred—it seems to me that the attempt to supply the deficiencies of modern ecclesiastical historians, would be quite preposterous. I need not say that, in mentioning these as the principal works which Milner wanted, I do not mean to exclude what are more properly called the Fathers, or the early ecclesiastical historians; for the propriety of studying them is so obvious, and they are so generally known, and so easily obtained, that it really did not occur to me to mention them. They would, however, carry the real church historian but a little way; and then, for the history of about a thousand years the books which I have named are invaluable. With them should be joined a class of books of which I apprehend that most of our public libraries (though I am sorry to say that I know very little of such places) would furnish more

nent paræneses et varia de moribus et ascetica, sive spiritualia. (53.)—*SEXTA*, Liturgias, et alia ad ecclesiasticam disciplinam et sacramenta spectantia. (61.)—*SEPTIMA*, Chronologias, et varias de rebus ecclesiasticis et prophanis tam universales, quam particulares historias comprehendit (33.)—*OCTAVA*, Poemata, Hymnos, et Carmina variorum christianorum authorum, exhibet. (56.)—*NONA*, varios autores et opuscula, quæ ad præcedentes classes facile referri non potuerunt continet.” (29.) I have here, for brevity’s sake merely put (in parenthesis) what appears to me to be the number of authors belonging to each class; but in this index the author’s name, the title of his work, and the volume and page at which it is to be found, are all stated.

or less, though they are not often found in private collections, because few people care for such reading; and those students who might be tempted to look at them, as well as others which I have mentioned, are discouraged by the general and sweeping condemnations of popular writers.* I mean such works as the *Gallia Christiana*, and (if I may use such a barbarism) the *Sacras* of various countries, together with such collections as those of D'Achery, Martene and Durand, Leibnitz, Labbe, &c. which contain a great number of lives or memoirs, as well as treatises, not to be found elsewhere. With these—not to exclude some of the books which Milner used, but for the purpose, for which he should have used them—that is, not as sources but as indications of sources, and that the historian may know, and truly and intelligibly describe, the circumstances of the persons of whom he writes—should be joined at least the *Annals* of Baronius, and his continuators, the *Memoirs* of Tillemont, the *Histoire generale des Auteurs Sacrés* of Ceillier, Cave's *Historia Literaria*, and Bingham's *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*.

Let me repeat that I do not mean to set it forth as necessary

* Mr. Bickersteth says, "Milner, one well competent to judge, observes 'Ecclesiastical antiquity has been too much depreciated in our times, and students in divinity have been discouraged from the study of the Fathers. In truth, a selection of them ought to be made: to praise or dispraise the primitive writers in general, is obviously absurd.'" *Christian Student*, p. 212. Yet it may be observed that in forming "The Curate's Library" (*ibid.* p. 415.) Mr. Bickersteth entirely omits the Fathers; and recommends for the period between Josephus and Bishop Burnet, no history but "Milner and Scott's History of the Church of Christ." Indeed he plainly tells the student that, "not many works worth studying have come down to us from the sixth to the fifteenth century." (*ibid.* p. 223.) Of course I do not mean to represent it as the duty of all Christian Students to read all those books which I mention in the text as necessary for that Historian who is to supply the deficiencies of his predecessors. I am here only stating the reason which, I believe, hinders people from even looking at many books which I think they would find most interesting and instructive. Mr. Bickersteth has certainly a right "to offer such remarks as his own studies have furnished or occasioned;" but I am sorry that he has formed such an opinion, and I really hope that he will reconsider it.

that Milner should have read all these books ; or to cavil about the necessity of his having any one in particular ; but, as you tell me that I do not know what *kind* of reading was required as a preparation for Milner's undertaking, I think it right to state my opinion—and only as an opinion, without pretending to lay down the law on the subject—that any man proposing to himself such a task as Milner's ought to have these books, and books of this *kind*, within his reach ; should consider them as his sources and subsidiaries ; and be at least so far acquainted with them as to be able to refer to them when they are indicated as sources of information—but of all which I have named, I have found no reason to believe that Milner ever saw *one single book*. I do not know what Dean Milner might call “immense reading ;” but I am sure that the tenth part of anything deserving such a name, bestowed on the kind of books which I have mentioned, would have made the *History of the Church of Christ* abundantly more correct, more interesting, and more instructive than it is. Having thus given you my opinion on this point, let me ask for yours ; at the same time reminding you that the real matter under discussion is, not what Milner might, could, or should, have done—but, what he has done ; not how his work might have been made better, but whether it is, in fact, a good *History of the Church of Christ*. Let me beg you to come to this question ; and to notice the specific statements contained in this pamphlet ; and in the second letter to Mr. Rose. I hope, as I have said, fully and fairly to meet your strictures on my book respecting the *Albigenses* ; which, notwithstanding one or two very odd things which I have observed in your pamphlet, I fully admit that you are authorized to censure as much as you please. At the same time I feel the *Albigensian* question—important as it is—to be much less important than the question respecting Milner's *History*, and some other things which at present occupy my time. Those I have intermitted, and shall be happy, and feel it a duty, to intermit, to discuss the matter which forms the subject of this letter ; which is in fact much more than merely the

value of a particular book. I do not, however, feel bound—perhaps I should say authorized—to suspend employments which appear to me more important, to defend my reputation from a mere personal attack. Not that I would pretend to indifference on that point; or affect to be quite as well pleased that people should consider me guilty of all the falsehood and nonsense which you charge upon me, as that they should believe what I say to be true—but in fact I have no great reputation to defend, and, if I had, I am quite sure it would not be seriously injured in the minds of those whom I shall still venture to call “readers worth writing for;” an expression on which you are pleased to put an ill construction, but, in the use of which I had no reference to “literary fame;” and meant only, those persons who are really interested in the subject, and who will be at the trouble to understand it, as contradistinguished from those with whom the author’s name decides whether they are to read with blind confidence, or unconquerable prejudice. I feel therefore that I am not called upon to hurry myself; but still I hope to give early attention to the subject; and in the mean time,

I am,

Reverend Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

S. R. MAITLAND.

GLOUCESTER:

PRINTED BY JEW AND BRYANT, WESTGATE STREET.

By the same Author.

AN ENQUIRY into the grounds on which the PROPHEPIC PERIOD of DANIEL and ST. JOHN has been supposed to consist of 1260 Years. 8vo. 3s.

A Second ENQUIRY on the same subject, containing an examination of the Arguments of Mede—Remarks on a Passage in the Dialogues on Prophecy—On Reviews of the First Enquiry in the “Christian Observer,” “Christian Examiner,” and “Christian Guardian,”—and on the common interpretation of the seven heads of the Beast. 8vo. 6s.

AN ATTEMPT to ELUCIDATE the PROPHECIES concerning ANTICHRIST. 8vo. 1s.

THE 1260 DAYS, in Reply to a Review in the “Morning Watch.” 8vo. 1s.

A LETTER to the Rev. W. DIGBY, A. M. occasioned by his “Treatise on the 1260 Days.” 8vo. 2s.

FACTS and DOCUMENTS illustrative of the History, Doctrine, and Rites of the ancient ALBIGENSES and WALDENSES. 8vo. 16s.

THE 1260 DAYS, in Reply to the “STRICTURES of WILLIAM CUNINGHAME, Esq. of Lainshaw, in the County of Ayr. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

A LETTER to the Rev. HUGH JAMES ROSE, B.D., with STRICTURES on MILNER’S CHURCH HISTORY. Second Edition. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

A SECOND LETTER to the Rev. HUGH JAMES ROSE, B.D. containing NOTES on MILNER’S HISTORY of the CHURCH in the FOURTH CENTURY. 8vo. 2s. 6d.



